

# The Classical Review

MAY 1900.

Oxford, following after a seemly interval, and with some difference in the circumstances, the example of Cambridge, declared last term that its highest academical status should be open to students of 'Science' and 'Letters.' It is a subject of various speculation to what extent these will 'suppliate' for the new doctorates. Perhaps the number of applicants would have been increased by the success of an amendment to the statute, proposing that the new degrees might be conferred *iure dignitatis* upon Heads of Colleges and Professors who should apply for them; but by a large majority, and not without the approval of the classes concerned, the University refused to accept a proposal which might have involved uncertainty as to the value of the new degrees. The doctorates of Letters and Science are to be given upon published work; and this seems to be clearly the best method of awarding them. But it is to be hoped that, in adjudicating on the merits of applicants, account will be taken not merely of their 'books,' but of their uncollected contributions in the learned journals. The fees to be levied are high, though not higher than is the case with all such degrees. They would be paid more cheerfully if they should form part of some fund specially allocated to the encouragement of research and not be merged in the general income of the University.

NO. CXXIII. VOL. XIV.

versity. The need of such provision is incontestable; and the friends of research at Cambridge must regret that advantage was not taken of the institution of the new degrees there to do something towards meeting it.

It is high time the University Presses adopted the principle of the "illustrated classic" in their elementary publications. They should have led the movement; but they must at least follow it quickly, if they do not want to be left behind. In addition to Messrs. G. Bell and Sons' series, edited by Mr. Marchant, to which reference has already been made in these columns, we have Messrs. Blackie's, edited by Professor Tyrrell, and Messrs. Blackwood's, edited by Mr. H. W. Auden, each with merits of its own. There is one point in which the Latin texts may, and should, be improved. The former English and present American practice of marking the long vowels ought to be adopted.

We are glad to be able to announce the completion of the Latin catalogue of *Greek MS.* in the Ambrosian Library, Milan. Its compilers, Messrs. Domenico Bassi and Emilio Martini have taken the greatest care to regard the practical convenience of its users.

## UPON AESCHYLUS.

(Continued from page 119).

## II.

## CHOEPHORI.

159 ἰὼ τίς δορυσθενὴς ἀνὴρ  
ἀναλυτὴρ δόμου  
Σκυθικά τ' ἐν χεροῖν παλίντων [ἐν] ἔργῳ  
[βέλῃ] 'πιπάλλων' Ἀρης  
σχέδιά τ' αὐτόκωπα νωμῶν βέλη.

Ἀρης here has always seemed to me extremely dubious. The meaning cannot be 'what man or what god of War,' for that must have been *τίς ἀνὴρ*, *τίς Ἀρης*; or *ἡ τίς Ἀρης*; Besides, the opposite to *ἀνὴρ* should be *θεός*. But waiving those objections,—how strange an expression we are offered! 'What man is there armed with a spear to free the house, Ares wielding both a Scythian bow and hilted weapons in close combat?' Is Ares here the same as the man, or different? I do not see how he can be the same; Ἀρης could hardly mean 'a warrior' or 'a man of war'; when it is metaphorical, it is 'War' personified. The only way, I think, you can translate it is 'wielding like Ares in his hands a Scythian bow' etc. That is an idiomatic form of comparison in Greek; but the sense is no more satisfactory than before, for though the god was honoured most in Scythia as in Thrace, the characteristic weapon of Greek War would surely be anything rather than a bow. And the arms of Ares are in fact a spear and sword, Hom. E 852, Hes. *Scut.* 453-7.

The MS. gives ἐν ἔργῳ, which is certainly not elegant, as following ἐν χεροῖν; and metre convicts ἐν of being an interpolation. The record of Hesych. 'πιπάλλων: κραδαίνων, πάλλων confirms the genuineness of that word, and I see no reason for suspecting ἔργῳ, seeing nothing for which it is likely to be an error, while it makes good metre. But this presents us with another difficulty, ἔργῳ alone would naturally mean 'actually,' 'in fact,' as opposed to λόγῳ. ἐν ἔργῳ could mean 'in readiness,' 'prepared for action' (Eur. *I.T.* 1164), and in prose ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ could mean 'in the engagement,' 'in the action,' that is, of battle: but it may well be doubted whether ἔργῳ by itself would have been used in either of these senses. It might very well, however, be used in the second if it were defined, ἔργῳ Ἀρηος Simonid. 140 as ἔργον Ἀρηος Hom. A 734, *h. Aphr.* 10; and this I think affords a clue

for removing both blemishes at once by reading ἔργῳ 'πιπάλλων Ἀρηος,<sup>1</sup> or ἀρης. Aeschylus used this word in the *Supplikes* v. 86 ἀρης φηγάσιν, where cod. Guelf. has ἀρης, cod. M ἄρης with a schol. which offers interpretations according to either reading, ἀρης or Ἀρης. Whether the Epic form of the word should be retained is a minor question.

It is a *man*, then, that they cry for to come armed as their deliverer with spear and Scythian bow and weapons for close combat in his hands,—and the mention of the *Scythian bow* shows that the man in their imagination is a *Heracles*, the Saviour and Purger of the world from noisome beasts and human bullies; for the chief weapon of that famous archer was the Scythian bow: schol. Theocr. xiii. 56 ἐχρήτο δὲ Ἡρακλῆς τοῖς Σκυθικοῖς τόξοις, διδασχθεὶς παρὰ τινος Σκύθου Τεντάρου, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Ἡρόδωρος καὶ Καλλίμαχος. Lycophr. 56 Tzetzes p. 1175. Ath. 289 f Pythermus relates that Themison affected to be Heracles, ἡμφιεσμένος λεοντήν· ἐφόρει δὲ καὶ τόξα Σκυθικά καὶ ῥόπαλον ἐκράτει. And this is how his armament<sup>2</sup> is described by Soph. *Trach.* 510:

ὁ δὲ Βακχίας ἄπο  
ἦλθε παλίντονα Θήβας  
τόξα καὶ λόγχας ῥόπαλόν τε τινάσσων

spears, and παλίντονα τόξα,<sup>3</sup> and a club. The natural meaning of the puzzling αὐτόκωπα is 'with handle in one piece,' like αὐτόγνος. Inapplicable to a sword, it may be explained as alluding to the *club*.

Καθαίρειν is the word habitually applied to Heracles' purgation of the earth (e.g. Soph. *Trach.* 1012, 1061, Arrian *Indica* viii. 8, Plut. *Theseus* 7, Dio. Chrys. I. p. 194, Arr. Epict. iii. 26 ὁ δὲ Ἡρακλῆς ἀπάσης γῆς καὶ θαλάττης ἄρχων καὶ ἡγέμων ἦν, καθαρῆς ἀνομίας καὶ ἀδικίας, εἰσαγωγὴς δὲ δικαιοσύνης καὶ δσιότητος); the house of the Atreidae is also to be purged of foul oppressors, ὅταν ἀφ' ἐστίας μύσος πᾶν ἐλαθῇ καθαρμοῖσιν ἀτᾶν

<sup>1</sup> And I see that in his edition of the play (1899) Dr. Blaydes has suggested Ἀρηος.

<sup>2</sup> See Prof. Jebb's note on *Philoct.* 727.

<sup>3</sup> 'Like a Scythian bow' is the comparison used by an unlearned man in Agathon *fr.* 4. 3 (Ath. 454 d) to describe the letter Σ, which illustrates the epithet παλίντονα: see Stein on Hdt. vii. 69, quoting Ammian. xxii. 8. 37.

Δατηρίους 964, σὺ τ' ὦ πατρῶν δῶμα· σοὶ γὰρ ἔρχομαι δίκη καθαρτῆς says Orestes in Soph. *El.* 69. Is it not probable, then, on all accounts that the type of deliverer in the Chorus' mind is Heracles?

It may be urged that nevertheless the fighting power of Heracles might be described as Ἄρης, just as the fierce attack of Orestes and Pylades is described as διπλοῦς λέων, διπλοῦς Ἄρης in *v.* 964. But in reference to Heracles this is just the term that might have been avoided. In legend he and Ares meet; and when they meet, it is as enemies and rivals, and the Dorian hero is victorious.<sup>1</sup> The Ἀσπίς Ἡρακλέους of Hesiod is the story of his fight with Cycnus and his father Ares; armed with bow and spear, he wounds him there (*v.* 461) as he had wounded him before in Pylos (*v.* 359); when he strove with Achelous, Ares vainly lent his aid against him (Pausan. vi. 19. 12). In his combat against Geryon, it was the giant who στείχεν ἴσος Ἀρεὶ βίαν (Aesch. *fr.* 74. 7).

324 Πυρὸς [ῆ] μαλερὰ γνάθος: anyone giving information about the following scholium will be rewarded by my grateful thanks: ἡ γνάθος συνήθης, ὥς ὁ κρημνὸς λέγει Πίνδαρος καὶ ἡ ἡχὴ Σιμωνίδης. W. Dindorf in the *Thesaurus* quotes a few occurrences of αἱ γνάθοι, which he thinks are merely slips in writing: here the schol. appears to speak as though the feminine were a poetical use. But who said anything except ὁ κρημνός? and what is possible except ἡ ἡχὴ? Bergk, quoting the scholium among the fragments of Pindar and Simonides, makes no remark.

482 schol. should be εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἄτιμος ἐν πυροῖσι κνισωτοῖς ἔσῃ παρ' εὐδείπνοις χθονός· οὕτως τὸ ἐξῆς. ὁ ἐστί, παρὰ κατοικομένοις δαίπνῃ τιμωμένοις, τῶν ἄλλων νεκρῶν μεταλαμβάνόντων ἐναγισμῶν, σὺ ἄτιμος ἔσῃ.

506 ἄκου', ὑπὲρ σοῦ τοιαῶν ἔστ' ὀδύρματα, αὐτὸς δὲ σψέξῃ τόνδε τιμήσας λόγον.

The stress is obviously upon ὑπὲρ σοῦ as upon αὐτός; 'these lamentations are on your behalf; it is your own interest to listen to them.' Now what is τοιαῶν? It appears to me it could only stand if it had been the predicate with the stress upon it, and that as it is, we must have τὰδε: therefore I would read

ἄκου', ὑπὲρ σοῦ τοι τὰδ' ἔστ' ὀδύρματα

<sup>1</sup> Thus when Heracles instituted the Olympian games and won the pancration and wrestling, Ares was beaten in boxing by Apollo, Pausan. v. 7. 10.

for τοι in such cases adds emphasis: e.g. 922 σὺ τοι σεαυτὴν, οὐκ ἐγώ..., Ag. 1030 σοὶ τοι λέγουσα πάνετα σαφὴ λόγον. 'It is you she speaks to in quite plain terms, and now pauses for an answer,' *Supp.* 375 σὺ τοι πόλις 'Thou art the city,' Soph. *Phil.* 1095, *El.* 582, 624, Eur. *Heracl.* 732, and commonly σέ τοι λέγω, etc.

541 εἰ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν χώρον ἐκλιπὼν ἐμοὶ οὐφείσεσθαι σπαργανῇ πλείετο

The purport of *v.* 542 was clear enough; but I had been accustomed to regard the verb as beyond our means of determining. On the contrary, it can be restored with absolute confidence. We had overlooked the scholium upon it, which is ἐπιμελείας ἡξιοῦτο. I happened to have remarked this noticeable phrase used elsewhere to explain κομίζειν in its sense of 'tend' or 'nurse'; so I turned at once to lexicons and scholia and found what I expected. κομιδῇ is regularly explained by ἐπιμέλεια, and the stock interpretations of κομῆν and κομίζειν are ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, ἐπιμελῶς τρέφειν or ἐπιμελείας ἀξιοῦν. It is unnecessary to transcribe examples; they may be found abundantly in the *Thesaurus*, Ebeling *Lex. Hom.*, Hesych. ii. p. 224. ἐπιμελείας ἀξιοῦν was the definition of Apollonius and Apion (Et. Gud. p. 607\* 48).

The line, then, was

οὐφεις ἔπειτα σπαργανῇ κομίζετο.

Thus a new form σπαργανῇ 'swaddling' may be added in the Dictionaries to σπάργανον. There are many like it (see Lobeck *Proll.* 175 sq.); and both feminine and neuter terminations occur for instance in δοκάνη δόκανον, δρεπάνη δρέπανον, θηγάνη θήγανον, πλαβάνη πλάβανον, ὄχανη, ὄχανον. But the verb σπαργανῶ is already found in Plat. *Legg.* 789 E and Hesych. s.v. Σπάρξαι, as πλεκτανῶ *Cho.* 1047 besides πλεκτανῶ.

ἔπειτα had always appeared to me the only natural correction of ἐπάσα. It is a further detail, the second here as in *v.* 527 ἐν σπαργάνοις παιδὸς ὀρμίσαι δίκην 'havened it, like a child, in swaddling-clothes', indicating that the serpent typifies a human child. The correction had been made before by Martin, and by Peile who argues for it quite correctly p. 249.

I should not have narrated all my process here without a purpose: this was a good example of the method by which scholia may be used for recovering the text. The secret of their value in this application is that they are practically constant. Annotators do not, when interpreting, give merely the best

word that comes into their own heads, but they use traditionary and accepted synonyms; the same word is explained by the same equivalent in any place and any author. This is equally true of their formulae in dealing with constructions.<sup>1</sup>

612 ἀλλαδῆτιν' ἐν λόγοισι στυγεῖν  
φοινίαν Σκύλλαν

612 appears thus in M, with such deficiency of accent. It has always been assumed, since Portus, that ἄλλα should be ἄλλαν, and it may be right. Of ἄλλαν δὲ τιν' Hermann says 'non est hic nexus is qui Aeschilo convenire videatur. Scribendum potius est ἄλλαν δ' ἔστιν' comparing *P.V.* 828 ἄλλαν δ' ἄκουσον. . . That in my judgement too is an improvement, and good Greek certainly in itself; but I have a notion that will account I think for the MS. more easily:

[ἄλλ' οἷδ', εἰ τιν' ἐν λόγοις, στυγεῖν

'among any in story'. The effect of that in Greek will be more easily felt than a translation found for it in English. It does not merely mean 'I can find hatred in my heart for', like *Soph. fr.* 275 τὸν Ἀἶδαν οἷδε γῆρας οἷδε φιλεῖν, *A.P.* xii. 103 οἷδα φιλεῖν φιλέοντας ἐπίσταμαι, ἦν μ' ἀδικῇ τις, μισεῖν, but rather 'among all in story I know one who deserves my hate', like *fr.* 300. 1 γένος μὲν αἰνεῖν ἐκμαθὼν ἐπίσταμαι, *Phrynich.* 20. 1 πιθήκους οἷδ' ἐτέρους τινὰς λέγειν, *Archestrat.* (*Ath.* 29 c) 17 οἷδα δὲ καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν βοτρυσταγῇ ἔρνη εἰπεῖν αἰνέσαι τε, and others I quoted in the *Journal of Philology*, xxvi. p. 106 in emending *Callim. A.P.* xii. 130. 6 ἐγὼ δὲ λέγων ἀτρεκέως οἷδα μόνος, which should be λέγειν ἀτρεκέ' or τῶτρεκέ' as *Meleag. A.P.* vii. 428. 10.

In v. 613 Σκύλλαν is unmetrical; the proper name, as often, has been substituted for some descriptive word, which would here be κόραν (*Merkel*). Even if Σκύλλαν suited metre, κόραν would be better, for what follows presently turns wholly on the relationships of the murderesses quoted.

Preuss thought that the two following strophes ought to be transposed. Dr. Wecklein records the opinion in the margin of his text, and in his school edition actually adopts

<sup>1</sup> I assumed that the scholium had always been overlooked, because it appeared from Wecklein's Appendix of conjectures that no use had yet been made of it. But Dr. Postgate has since pointed out to me that it was remarked by Conington as the phrase 'by which Hesychius explains κομίζειν,' and, this fact Paley says 'it is important to observe,' adding that the Schol. probably found κομίζετο. Yet to Conington it 'seems clear that σπάργαν' formed part of the original text,' and Paley reads σπαργάνοις ἀπλίσετο.

that arrangement. I can hardly conceive how such a thing should come about; but that it should have been propounded and approved will show how unsatisfactory other methods of interpretation have appeared. I believe the true arrangement to be this:

621 ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπεμνασάμην ἀμείλιχον  
πόνον — B. ἀκαίρως δέ' δυσφίλεις γαμή-  
λευν' ἀπεύχετον δόμοις  
γυναικοβούλους τε μήτιδας φρενῶν  
ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ τευχισφόρῳ,  
ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ, δάοις ἐπαικῶς σ' ἐβείς;  
τίω δ' ἀθέρμαντον ἐστὶν δόμων,  
γυναικείαν ἀτολμον αἰχμάν.

A. κακῶν δὲ πρὸς βεβύται τὸ Λήμνιον  
630 λόγῳ γοῶται δὲ δῆποθ' ἐν κατὰπτυστον,  
ἦκασεν δὲ τις  
τὸ δευρὼν αὖ Λημνίοισι πῆμασιν  
θεοστγήφῳ δ' ἄγει  
βροτῶν ἀτιμωθὲν οἴχεται γένος·  
σ' ἐβεί γὰρ οὕτως τὸ δυσφίλεις θεοῖς·  
τί τῶνδ' οὐκ ἐνδίκως ἀγείρω;

626 δῆποιος ἐπαικῶς ἐβασ M 627 τίω δ' M

630 γοῶται δὲ δὴ ποθεῖ M

The point I start from is that the last line is a *triumphant reply* to an objection that the examples quoted are not pertinent, are out of place: and it is plain that this objection is to be found in v. 622 ἀκαίρως δέ, which is synonymous with οὐκ ἐνδίκως. That must be an interruption by another speaker. The clue of a *retort* leads on to seeing that σέβει and ἀτιμωθὲν are answers to τίω δ' (*Stanley*) and my reading σέβεις. In order to understand this interruption, we must look into the purport of the whole.

The subject of the Chorus is the audacious imagination of man's heart; the disastrous consequences of human passion generally, and the desperate acts to which women especially are induced by ungoverned and illicit loves: what is in their mind is plainly the criminal relation of Clytemnestra with Aegisthus, leading to the murder of the husband:

ἀλλ' ὑπέρτολμον ἀνδρὸς φρόνημα τίς λέγοι  
καὶ γυναικῶν φρεσὶν τλαμόνων  
παντόλμον ἐρωτὰς ἀταῖσι συννόμους βροτῶν;  
ἐυζύγους δ' ὁμανλίας  
θηλυκρατὴς ἀπέρωτος ἔρως παρανικᾷ  
κνωδάλων τε καὶ βροτῶν.

This theme they illustrate by the example of Althaea, the mother whose revengeful anger burnt the brand on which depended the life of her own son; and of the daughter Scylla, who was bribed by her father's enemies to take her father's life. They are



then proceeding 'And since I have made mention of heartless deeds of sorrow,' when they are suddenly interrupted by a voice complaining that the examples do not fit the case—'Nay, not to the purpose! an abhorred adulterous alliance and plots conceived by a wedded woman's mind against her wedded man,<sup>1</sup> a man and a soldier,<sup>2</sup> such' is the petulant question, 'do you hold in admiration beseeeming enemies? My admiration is for a passionless domestic hearth, a womanly and unadacious temper' [not for *ὑπερτολμον φρόνημα*, not for *παντόλμους ἔρωτας*]. The meaning of *σίβεις* is 'since you pass over such a case as that, I suppose that you approve it!'

To this no immediate answer is returned; the Chorus appears at first to ignore it loftily, continuing thus—and judge, observing the order and emphasis of the words in Greek, whether it is not a reply: 'But the chief place among crimes in history is held by the Lemnian: when a man bewails some abominable horror, the monstrous outrage is compared to the "Lemnian tragedy": by reason of sin abhorred by god, the race of them has perished with dishonour among men—for "admiration" is a regard in which no one holds that which is loathsome in the sight of heaven. What is there among these that I adduce *improperly*? None indeed; for all are crimes committed from various motives by misguided women; but the last, the murder of husbands by their wives, is the most execrable of them all; it has become a proverbial synonym for everything most monstrous and abominable, a thing abhorred by gods and men alike. That is the *climax* they were leading up to when they were interrupted by that impatient voice; and it will not be denied, I think, that the interruption makes it still more telling and impressive—the reason, of course, that Aeschylus employed the artifice.

This free dramatic treatment of the Chorus<sup>3</sup> is characteristic of the Attic drama in its Aeschylean stage. The interruption most resembling this is to be found in *Supp.* 88, if my view of it is right—and I think it is unintelligible otherwise—

<sup>1</sup> 980 *ἦτις δ' ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ τοῦτ' ἐμήσατο στόγος ἐξ οὗ τέκνον ἦνεγχε' ὅπδ' ὤνην βάρος*, what think you she would do *τὸ δ' αὖ μ' ἔκατι κἀκδικόν φρονήματος*;

<sup>2</sup> See *Eum.* 628-640, and compare *Ag.* 1625 *γύναι, σὺ... ἀνδρὶ στρατηγῷ τόνδ' ἐβούλευσας μόνον*; That is addressed to Aegisthus, and the phrase *γυναικοβούλους μήτιδας* is so framed that it might include Aegisthus here; but that is by the way.

<sup>3</sup> K. O. Mueller *History of Greek Literature* I. p. 414 sqq.

A. εἴθ' εἴη Δίος εὖ παναληθῶς—

B. Δίος ἡμέρος οὐκ εὐθήρατος ἐτύχθη

It does not seem necessary, therefore, to seek outside the Chorus itself for the complaining critic, though the possibility is of course conceivable. The Chorus itself, Dr. Verrall thinks, was composed of men, and not of women; that 'the strong denunciation of women is rather more appropriate to men' is certainly a reasonable argument.

The sentiment of *v.* 627 would be very well expressed as an aspiration by *τίοι μ' ἀθήρμαντον ἐστίαν* 'I hope I may always...' cf. *Pind. P.* xi. 50, *Eur. Ion* 150, 502, *fr.* 893 (*Ath.* 158e), *Callim. N. Del.* 98, *Theocr.* xxvi. 30, *xvi.* 66, *xvii.* 8, *Moschus v.* 12, *A.P.* v. 120.<sup>4</sup>

Instead of Enger's reading in 630 I had thought of *γοῦται δ' ὀδύποθ' εἰς κατάπυστον*,...

643 *Δίκας δ' ἐρείδεται πυθμῆν, προχαλκεύει δ' Αἶσα φασηγουργός*

Pausanias *v.* 18. 2 describes from the chest of Cypselus a scene where *Δίκη* has 'Αδίκη by the throat and is beating her with a stick, *ράβδῳ παίονσα*. Mr. Frazer *iii.* p. 612 gives from a red-figured vase an exact representation of the scene, except that Justice there is literally *hammering* Injustice. Here Destiny is the armourer who forges the weapon for Justice to employ.<sup>5</sup> In *Ag.* 1537, with language very similar, one would expect to find also the same image. Yet the MSS. give *δίκη* (or *δίκαι*) *δ' ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμα θήγει βλάβης πρὸς ἄλλαις θηγάται μοῖραι*. It seems probable that Triclinius was correct in writing *δίκαι*, which will mean 'for the hand of Justice.' In face of *Αἶσα* it would be rash to alter *μοῖραι*: otherwise, modifying a suggestion by Prof. Robinson Ellis, we might perhaps read *θήγεται... θηγάται αἶρα*:—supposing that could mean a chopping instrument requiring to be sharpened. It is usually explained by *σφῦρα*, and in a fragment of Callimachus, the only place where it occurs in literature, *αἰράων ἔργα* stands for 'blacksmith's work.' Hesychius, however, and Bekk. *An.* 359. 19 give *αἶρα*: *σφῦρα. ἀξίνη*: and might not *μαχ—αἶρα* mean originally a *battle-axe*? But one of the sign-posts to the sentence is the genitive *βλάβης*, which according to my ear should be dependent neither on *πρᾶγμα* nor on *θηγάται* but on the final substantive,

<sup>4</sup> These optatives will leave no doubt that *ἄν* in *Eur. Bacch.* 422 is an interpolation.

<sup>5</sup> Compare Hermann's reading in 882 *τοῖς νῦν αὐτῆς ἐπιθήνου πέλας αὐχὴν πεσεῖσθαι πρὸς δίκης πεπληγμένους*.

θήγεται βλάβης μοῖρα, as you have θανάτου μοῖρα (*Pers.* 919, *Ag.* 1463). The only other possibility I see is that βλάβης is an error for an accusative, θηγάνει βλάβας or βλάβην.

688 ὦ δυσπάλαιστε τῶνδε δωμάτων Ἄρά  
ὡς πολλὰ ἐπωπᾶς κάκποδῶν εὖ κείμενα  
τόξοις πρόσωθεν εὐσκόποις χειρουμένη  
φίλων ἀποφίλοις μετὴν παναθλίαν  
καὶ νῦν Ὀρέστης—ἦν γὰρ εὐβούλως ἔχων  
ἔξω κομίζων ὀλεθρίου πηλοῦ πόδα—  
νῦν δ'...

The first four lines have been punctuated at various places, the hinge of the question being whether καὶ in κάκποδῶν means 'and' or 'although.' One thing, I think, may be allowed—it must mean either one or else the other; but we cannot have it both ways. Weil with Bothe punctuates at ἐπωπᾶς, and takes καὶ to be 'and,' coupling the two clauses ἐπωπᾶς and ἀποφίλοις. The sentence in this arrangement reads to me as though εὖ κείμενα were a new object, not an epithet of πολλὰ, 'how many things thou markest, and subduing things well-bestowed out of the way, strippest me...' I cannot prove that this is wrong, only I think it cannot mean 'how many things thou markest, and subduing them, although well-bestowed out of the way' (καὶ χειρουμένη αὐτὰ, καίπερ ἐκποδῶν εὖ κείμενα).

The general feeling, however, which I share, has been that 'although' should be expressed, and that καὶ expresses it. If that is so, the following verb requires a connecting particle, and τ' accordingly was inserted by Hartung and δ' by Paley after φίλων. There are three reasons why I think that we should rather read τόξοις πρόσωθεν δ': first, because τόξοις χειρουμένη goes more fitly with ἀποφίλοις than with ἐπωπᾶς; secondly, it gives a better balance to the rhythm; and thirdly, this is a more likely place for a particle to have been omitted. When δέ or γάρ are placed in verse later than their normal place in prose, they experience at the hands of copyists one of two things commonly—either they are transposed to the usual position or else they are neglected: for example 700 πρὸς δυσσεβείας <δ'> Pauw, *Supp.* 540 τὸ πρὸς γυναικῶν <δ'> Tucker. My sentence reads then 'how many things hast thou thine eye upon, though well situated (or "disposed") out of the way, and with unerring marksmanship strippest me of one after another of my own! As now Orestes—for he was prudently advised in getting his feet out of the deadly mire—yet, for all that, even him thou hast now brought low.' Orestes was ἐκ-

ποδῶν εὖ κείμενος: yet even thus he has not escaped the Curse's aim.

790 Of the restoration here I now feel sure:

ἴσθι δ' ἀνδρὸς φίλον πῶλον εὖ  
νιν ζυγέειν ἐν ἄρματι  
πημάτων ἐν δρόμῳ προστιθεῖς  
μέτρον τις ἂν σφῆζόμενον ῥυθμόν  
794 δάπεδον ἂν τοῦτ' ἴδοι  
ἀνομένον βημάτων ὄρεγμα.

'Bethink thee that Orestes in his painful mission is as a colt harnessed in a chariot: it is by imposing moderation while the race is being run that one may see the eagerness of straining steps preserving over this course their ordered pace.' σφῆζόμενον was rightly understood by Blomfield as the middle; it agrees with ὄρεγμα and it governs ῥυθμόν. Orestes has a race before him (ἔλασε δ' ἐς τὸ πᾶν is the phrase applied to him when his enterprise is successfully accomplished, *v.* 938, ἦκαι γὰρ οὐκ ἀχρεῖον ἐκπλεθρον δραμῶν ἀγῶνα *Eur. El.* 881); now, if he is to be successful, he must not be allowed to get out of hand and run away, but be kept always under control. In other words, it is of vital moment that he should remain cool, and the Chorus pray that Zeus will therefore put the check upon him.

Except that I have changed the punctuation and removed the accent from τις (in the MS., as in scores of other places, τίς<sup>1</sup>) the only alteration made is in *v.* 794, where ἴδοι, of course, had been conjectured long ago by Portus. The MS. τοῦτ' ἰδεῖν δάπεδον is meaningless and unmetrical. My reading agrees exactly with the corresponding line

διὰ δίκας πᾶν ἔπος  
ἔλακον

(which is certain, for πᾶν ἔπος 'every syllable' is a frequent and invariable phrase), and the words δάπεδον ἂν τόδε occur in *Pind. N. vii.* 87. 'This course' is the adventure he is now engaged in.

The conception of Orestes' task as a contest appears throughout the *Electra* of Euripides in many phrases: 613 *OP.* ἦκω 'πὶ τόνδε στεφανόν. 693 εὖ πυρσεύετε κραυγῇν ἀγῶνος τοῦδε, 749 *HA.* πῶς ἀγῶνος ἦκομεν; 759 Orestes' attendant with the news of his success, ὦ καλλίνικοι παρθένοι Μυκηνίδες, νικῶντ' Ὀρέστην πᾶσιν ἀγγέλλω φίλοις, tells *Electra* that the servants of the house στέφουσιν εὐθὺς σοὶ κασιγνήτου κᾶρα χαίροιτες ἀλαλίζοντες. The Chorus thereupon exclaim

<sup>1</sup> But the schol. is written on τις ἂν... 'λείπει τὸ ὅπως. καὶ τὸ ἰδεῖν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἴδοι. ὁ δὲ νοῦς, ὅπως ἂν τις τοῦτο ἴδοι,...

860 νίκας στεφαναφορίαν<sup>1</sup> κρείσσω παρ'  
'Αλφειοῦ ῥέεθροις τελέσας κασίγνητος σθέν'  
ἄλλ' ἐπάειδε καλλίνικον ὠδᾶν ἑμῷ χόρῳ.  
Electra says ὦ γαῖα καὶ νύξ ἦν ἐδε-  
κόμην πάρος, νῦν ὁ μὲν τοῦ μὲν ἀμπτ-  
χαί τ' ἐλευθεραί. . . φέρε κόμης ἀγῶματ'  
ἐξενέγκωμαι, φίλαι, στέψω τ' ἀδελφοῦ κράτα  
τοῦ νικηφόρου: and when Orestes appears  
she welcomes him as a conqueror 878-887  
with ὦ καλλίνικε πατὴρ ἐκ νικηφόρου. . . δέξαι  
κόμης σῆς βοστρύχων ἀνδήματα, ἧκεις γὰρ οὐκ  
ἀχρεῖον ἐκπλεθρον δραμῶν ἀγῶν' ἐς οἴκους. . . and  
says to Pylades στέφανον. . . δέχον' φέρη γὰρ  
καὶ σὺ τοῦδ' ἴσον μέρος ἀγῶνος.

The hint for all this is contained in the  
two brief passages of Aeschylus already  
quoted, and in *vv.* 582, 725, 865-7. I think  
there must have been another in what  
follows immediately in this same chorus.  
After their appeal to Zeus, they pray to the  
deities worshipped at shrines within the  
house; and then they turn—in his own  
paenonic metre—to Apollo, whose charge has  
laid this enterprise upon Orestes:

802 τὸ δὲ καλῶς κτίμενον ὦ μέγα ναῖον  
στόμιον, εὖ δὸς ἀναδεῖν δόμον ἀνδρός,  
καὶ νῦν ἐλευθερίως  
λαμπρὸν ἰδεῖν φίλοις  
ὁμμασιν ἐκ νοφερᾶς καλύπτρας.

καταμενων mut. in κτάμενον M: corr. Bamberger.  
ἀνιδεῖν M. λαμπρῶς M: corr. H. L. Ahrens.  
ὁμμασι νοφερᾶς M: corr. Hermann.

'And thou that inhabitest that great fair-  
built cavern, grant that we may well en-  
garland a man's house, and that her eyes  
may look forth bright by privilege of free-  
dom, with a friendly gaze, out of her gloomy  
shroud.' The texture of the verse, as com-  
monly with Aeschylus, is very close. At  
present δνόφοι καλύπτουσι δόμους δεσποτῶν  
θανάτοισι (50): its look is hostile, because  
that is the attitude of its occupants towards  
Orestes; gloomy and δουλοπρεπές because the  
sympathisers with his cause are kept in  
subjection under fear (see 959 sqq.), both  
Orestes and Electra are as it were πεπραμένοι  
(132), and she herself is ἀντιδουλος (135):  
but if God will, the rightful owners and  
their party will be able soon to wear the  
fearless mien of freedom, when the house of  
Orestes may abandon her black veil and put  
on garlands for a victory in what may be  
termed a *Pythian* contest.

Whether my conjecture is right or not, I  
have no doubt about the rest: ἐλευθερίως has  
its proper sense, and the adjective is used by  
Theognis 538, 916; which, since they are

<sup>1</sup> The exact restoration is not clear, but unimportant for the purpose.

the earliest examples, ought to be added to  
the dictionaries. The first of the passages  
begins 535 οὔποτε δουλείῃ κεφαλὴ ἰθεία  
πέφκεν.—λαμπρῶς was simply the gloss on  
λαμπρὸν as 284 ὀρώντα λαμπρὸν, Pind. *N.* vii.  
65 ἐν τε δαμόταις ὁμῳι δέρομαι λαμπρὸν: cf.  
x. 39 ἀξιοθεῖν κεν. . . Ἄργεϊ μὴ κρύπτειν φάος  
ὁμμάτων, Eur. *H.F.* 221 Θῆβαις ἔθηκεν ὁμῶ  
ἐλεύθερον βλέπειν, and in general illustration  
*Ion* 1469, Pind. *I.* iii. 39 = iv. 21.

The following will show that 'to crown  
the house' is quite a natural phrase:  
Pind. *P.* xi. 14 ἐστὶαν τρίτον ἐπὶ στέφανον  
πατρῶν βαλὼν, ii. 6 κρατέων τηλαυγέσιν  
ἀνέδησεν Ὀρτυγίαν στεφάνους: cf. *P.* ix. 4.  
*A.P.* ix. 588 by reason of a victory at the  
games ἐπτάπυλοι δὲ Θῆβαι καὶ γενέτωρ ἐστὶ φεβ'  
Ἑρμοκράτης. Simonid. *A.P.* xvi. 2 Theognetus  
by his victory πατέρων ἀγαθὸν ἐστέφανωσε  
πόλιν. Eur. *H.F.* 773 in that fine Hebraic  
outburst of triumphant song: 'Ἰσμήν' ὦ  
στεφαναφόρει, ξισταί θ' ἐπτάπυλοι πόλεως ἀνα-  
χορεύσας' ἀγυαί after the καλλίνικος ἀγὼν of  
Heracles: cf. *fr.* 282. 18, *Tro.* 566. Simonid.  
*Ep.* 98 οὔτος Ἀδείμαντου κείνου τάφος σὺ  
διὰ βουλὰς Ἑλλὰς ἐλευθερίας ἀμφέθετο  
στέφανον.

I do not profess to feel sure that my  
reading is the right one, but it seemed to  
deserve the statement of a case for it. What  
causes a little discomfort is the εὖ: and the  
effect of it should be weighed with any verb  
that is proposed. ἀνάγειν (Weil) would make  
good sense 'to lift up the house again',  
'recover it'. Dr. Blaydes has offered εὖ δὸς  
αὖ ἰδεῖν δόμον ἀνδρός, on which I remarked  
the shortening of αὖ as doubtful, not finding  
any certain instance. It was however clearly  
enough so used by Plat. *Com. fr.* 153. 3  
ἐστᾶσ' αὐτῶν οἱ μὲν ἐκείθεν τῆς γραμμῆς, οἱ δ' αὖ  
ἐκείθεν, and by Archestratus (*Ath.* 300 d)  
οὔτος γὰρ αὖ ἐστὶν ἐκείθεν: and it is possible  
that it may have been so used in *Ag.* 1009,  
*Cho.* 959. One point I have always,  
rightly or wrongly, felt was cardinal: the  
addition of νῦν means that the subject of  
the sentence changes; if δόμον had been the  
subject of both verbs, νῦν would have been  
superfluous; if νῦν, as I have taken it, is the  
subject of the second verb, then δόμον is the  
object of the first, and *vice versa*.

848 οὐδὲν ἀγγέλων σθένος  
ὥς αὐτόσ' αὐτὸν ἄνδρα πείθεσθαι περί

instead of αὐτὸς is the only alteration  
necessary: 'messengers avail nothing com-  
pared with a man going and enquiring him-  
self upon the spot;' (αὐτοῦ) as 581 δειρ'  
ἐποπτεύσαι.

πείθεσθαι περί 'about (the matter)', is

exactly like *Ag.* 1358 τοῦ δρωντός ἐστι καὶ τὸ βουλευσάι περὶ.

862 ἡ πῦρ καὶ φῶς ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ  
δαίων ἀρχάς τε πολιτισσόνους  
<σφετέρους τε δόμους>  
ἔξει, πατέρων μέγαν ὄλβον.

This insertion of the usual 'anapaestic base' before the paroemiac makes πατέρων μέγαν ὄλβον what from its place in the sentence it should naturally be, an apposition: the δόμους of Orestes could hardly have been left unmentioned, while it is apparent how easily the line might be omitted.

956 κρατεῖται πῶς τὸ θεῖον παρὰ τὸ μὴ  
ὑπουργεῖν κακοῖς

παρὰ τὸ μὴ is an error for πρὸς τὸ μὴ, the regular scholiastic formula to explain an 'exegetical' infinitive; and I now believe that the whole of this sentence is a paraphrase, κρατεῖ τ' αἰεί πως τὸ θεῖον,...so that the original was

κρατεῖ πως αἰεί τὸ θεῖον τὸ μὴ  
(ὑπουργεῖν) κακοῖς

'Divinity proves ever strong enough not to...' A paraphrase would naturally have αἰεί πως, for that is the usual phrase (Blaydes on *Ar. Ran.* 414). No place for it could be more suitable than this.—I doubt whether ὑπουργεῖν is the original word; it is often used to explain others: exact correspondence would require κακοῖς . . .

κρατεῖν, 'to prevail,' is elsewhere constructed with an infinitive expressing what your superiority or predominance enables you to do: *Thuc.* iv. 104 κρατοῦντες τῷ πλήθει ὥστε μὴ αὐτίκα τὰς πόλεις ἀνοίγεσθαι. vi 74 ἐν ὅπλοις ὄντες ἐπεκράτουν μὴ δέχεσθαι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους. *Eur. Hel.* 1639 ΘΕ. ἀρχόμεσθ' ἄρ', οὐ κρατοῦμεν. XO. ὅσια δρᾶν, τὰ δ' ἔκδικ' οὐ. This construction should be restored in

*Ag.* 10 ἀλώσιμόν τε βᾶξιν—ὥδε γὰρ κρατεῖ  
γυναικὸς ἀνδρόβουλον ἐλπίζειν  
κέαρ.

'and tidings of her capture,—for so a woman's manlike spirit is sanguine to expect,' *ita enim sperare valet*. The MS. gives ἐλπίζων with ο written above ω, meaning ἐλπίζων, an obvious conjecture which naturally has not contented scholars. The correction I find from Wecklein had been proposed before by an anonymous critic in 1834, but I have never seen it even mentioned.

## EUMENIDES.

219 εἰ τοῖσιν οὖν κτείνουσιν ἀλλήλους χαλᾶς,  
τὸ μῆτ' ὄνοσθαι μῆτ' ἐποπτεύειν κότῳ

for μὴ γενέσθαι seems to me as probable as anything proposed: the verb was used by Aeschylus in *Supp.* 339.

259 The Erinyes come questing on the scent of blood:

καὶ νῦν ὃδ' ἐνθάδ' ἐστί που καταπτακόν  
ὄσμῃ βροτείων αἱμάτων με προσγελᾷ.  
ὄρα ὄρα μάλ' αὖ, πάντα λείδσε μὴ  
λάβῃ φύγδα βάς ματροφόνος ἀτίτας.

258 ὃδ' αὖ τ' ἐγὼ ν ἄλκᾳ ἔχων  
περὶ βρέτει πλεχθεῖς θεῶς ἀμβρότου  
ὑπόδικος θέλει γενέσθαι χερῶν.

258 is the point where he is *discovered* (cf. *O.C.* 117–138); therefore we require ὃδε 'here he is!' and αὖ is used in such cases rather than αὐτε (e.g. *Pers.* 906, 944 *P.V.* 67, 124, 588, 904, *Ag.* 1214, *Soph. Trach.* 987, 1031, 1082, *Aj.* 871, *Phil.* 1222). ὃδ' αὐτὲ γ' οὖν of the MS. is neither Greek nor metre; both, and sense as well, are given by my reading τέγεον ἄλκᾳ, that is, ὑπόστεγον, covert or protection under roof: for the word see Leaf on *Hom. Z* 248 τέγεοι θάλαμοι. 'τέγεος pro τέγειος, ut τέλειος pro τέλειος, hoc ex τέλος, illud ex τέγος' says Stephanus; as βρότειος, βρότειος: and there appears no reason why τέγειος should not be used for feminine as well as τέλειος, τέλειος, ἔλειος, ὄρειος, βρότειος and the like.

Comparison of the MS. readings in 255 and *O.C.* 121 suggests that in both we have corruptions of the *verbal*.

358 ἐπὶ τὸν ὃ διόμηναι  
κρατερόν ὄνθ' ὁμοίως  
μαυροῦμεν ὑφ' αἵματος νέου

The last two lines are unmetrical, and the reason is that the words have been transposed to indicate the construction. When this happens—and it happens commonly—one or more words are often replaced at the same time by an explanatory synonym. That is here the case with ὁμοίως, which cannot have been used by Aeschylus in the sense of ὁμως 'nevertheless,' but was regularly used by grammarians in explanation, chiefly of ἔμπης (see Ebeling *Lex. Hom.*). That is the natural word here, as e.g. *Theognis* 293 οὐδὲ λεῶν αἰεὶ κρέα δαίνονται, ἀλλά μιν ἔμπης καὶ κρατερόν περ ἐόντ' ἀγρεὶ ἀμχανίη. The exact restoration depends upon the *antistrophe*, in which unfortunately there is a word missing:



καταφέρω ποδὸς ἀκμάν,  
377 σφαλερὰ τανυδρόμοις  
κῶλα, δύσφορον ἄταν.

If 377 consisted of two paeons (hyporchematic, ὀρχησμοῖς 373) like the three verses preceding it, σφαλερὰ καὶ (Schoemann) τανυδρόμοις, or σφαλερ' ἄταν τ., we should read:

ἐπὶ τὸν ὧδ' ἰέμεναι (E. A. Ahrens).  
κρατερὸν ὄνθ' ὑπὸ νέον  
μαυροῦν αἵματος ἔμπας.

If 377 was what Weil suggests, σφαλερὰ τανυδρόμοις ὅμως, then we need not change μαυροῦμεν:

κρατερὸν ὄνθ' ὑφ' αἵματος  
μαυροῦμεν νέον ἔμπας.

That I believe to be the truth.

752 τὸ μὴ ἀδικεῖν σέβοντες ἐν διαιρέσει  
γνώμης δ' ἀπουσίας πῆμα γίγεται μέγα.  
[βαλοῦσά τ' οἶκον ψῆφος ὤλεσεν μία.]

Mr. Macnaghten's view (which I had overlooked) that this last line should be ejected, seems to me constantly more probable. Some examples of such a clause as 753 added for the sake of antithesis and introduced by δὲ 'whereas' are 105, *Ag.* 628, *Soph. O.T.* 615 Jebb, *Ant.* 672, *O.C.* 1534, *Pind. N. i.* 54, *Plat. Legg.* 775 C, *Aesch. Eum.* 697 as corrected, and, as I understand it, *Ag.* 357.

1033 (dactylic metre).

1033 βᾶτ' ἐν δόμοι μεγάλοι φιλότιμοι  
Νυκτὸς παῖδες ἄπαιδες ὑπ' εὐφροنى πομπᾷ  
1036 (εὐφραμεῖτε δὲ, χωρίζαι)  
γᾶς ὑπὸ κεύθεσιν ὠγγύιοισιν

1038 τιμαῖς καὶ θυσίαις περισέπται τύχαι τε  
(εὐφραμεῖτε δὲ πανδαμί).

1036 χωρεῖτε M: corr. Hermann.

The copyist, approaching the completion of his task, has written, as at the end of the *Agamemnon*, with great haste and carelessly. βᾶτ' ἐν δόμῳ is unmetrical and ungrammatical; βᾶτε δόμῳ (Wellauer) appears to me no more than metrical: βᾶτε δόμον [ὧ] μεγάλοι would be correct, but I feel constantly that ὧ, so far from having been inserted here, has been absorbed. βᾶτέ μοι ὧ would serve; but the MS. is better perhaps accounted for by ΒΑΤΕΟΔΟΝΩ, that is βᾶθ' ὁδόν, ὧ..., a suitable phrase for starting a procession; perhaps, indeed, a formula: cf. *Soph. fr.* 760. 1 βᾶτ' εἰς ὁδὸν δὴ πᾶς ὁ χειρῶναξ λέως.

In v. 1039 περισέπτα τύχοιτε has been conjectured; but the optative is out of place; it is a statement or a promise, not an aspiration. I return to an opinion arrived at many years ago that ΠΕΡΙΣΕΠ-ΤΑΙΤΥΧΑΙΤΕ is an error for ΠΕΡΙΣΕΠ-ΤΑΠΥΚΑΤΕ, τιμαῖς καὶ θυσίαις περισέπτα πυκασταί, a synonym of στεπταί, 'crowned, laden with honours.' It is a most natural expression: cf. *Plat. Rep.* 465 D our citizens, compared with Olympian-winners, τροφή καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσιν ὧσων βίος δέταται ἀναδοῖνται: *Ar. Eq.* 502 στεφάνοις κατὰπαστος, schol. κατὰμέστος, πλήρης, πεποικιλμένος. Pherecr. (*Hesych. ii.* p. 160) βριβομένης ἀγαθῶν ἐπὶ μέστα τραπέζης.

W. HEADLAM.

#### ON THE USE OF THE WORDS τραγῳδός AND κωμῳδός.

1. LIDDELL AND SCOTT in their *Lexicon* tell us that τραγῳδός is first 'a tragic poet or singer, these characters being originally one,' but 'later, when the poets ceased to act, the term τραγῳδός, tragedian, was for the most part confined to the tragic actor..., the tragic poet being-called τραγωδοποιός or τραγωδοδιδάσκαλος (but τραγῳδός continued also to be used in its old sense...).' They mention separately τραγωδοί 'members of the tragic chorus' and the plural τραγωδοί 'often used = τραγωδοί.' They therefore hold that in Attic Greek the word has at least three distinct meanings, poet, singer, actor. For κωμῳδός; they give only two, poet and actor,

thus leaving out, perhaps by inadvertence, the very first sense to which the form of the word points.

These ideas are probably universal among scholars who have not looked into the facts. In a way they have come down to us from Ammonius or earlier writers whom he followed, for he says κωμῳδός καὶ τραγῳδός λέγεται ὁ χορευτὴς καὶ ὑποκριτὴς κωμωδοποιός δὲ καὶ τραγωδοποιός οἱ ποιηταί ἐνίοτε δὲ συγχέουσι τὴν διαφορὰν. But in the *schol. ad Dem.* 5. 6, ὑποκριτὰς ἐκάλουν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι τοὺς νῦν τραγωδοὺς λεγομένους τοὺς ποιητὰς, οἷον τὸν Εὐριπίδην καὶ Ἀριστοφάνην, τοὺς δὲ νῦν ὑποκριτὰς οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν δύο τὸν μὲν δευτέρα-



γωνιστήν, τὸν δὲ τριταγωνιστήν· αὐτοὺς δὲ τοὺς ποιητὰς τῶν δραμάτων τραγωδοὺς καὶ τραγωδοδιδασκάλους, in spite of the obvious corruption (which Sauppe has tried to put right) it seems affirmed or implied that 'the ancients' did not use τραγῳδός of an actor, but did use it of a poet. The object of this paper is to question the tradition and to ask what grounds there are for saying that in good Attic the words were ever used of either poet or actor as such.

2. It is clear from the very form of the words that τραγῳδοί and κωμῳδοί originally and properly meant *singers* of a certain kind, that is members of the tragic or comic chorus, who before the introduction of actors were the sole performers.<sup>1</sup> This sense of *singers* appears throughout Greek literature, and there can be no doubt about it.<sup>2</sup> But in certain phrases and contexts the words came to signify the performance rather than the performers; not the men in themselves, but the men as doing something.

The common form of this is a phrase which occurs over and over again in inscriptions and is found also in speeches or the documents, genuine or spurious, which they contain and in a few other places. The phrase directs a proclamation to be made, or speaks of something as done, τραγωδοῖς or τραγωδοῖς καινοῖς. See *C.I.A.* II. Index s.v. τραγῳδοί: Aesch. in *Ctes.* 36, 45, 176: Dem. *De Cor.* 84, 115, 116. Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 603 c: Luc. 5, 51: Ael. *V.H.* 2. 13.

The dative is half local, half temporal, like Διονυσίοις, Παναθηναίοις. It means 'at the performance of the τραγῳδοί,' 'at the

<sup>1</sup> From these words are formed directly κωμικοδιδάσκαλος and -αλία, τραγωδοδιδάσκαλος and -αλία (the last abstract substantive not found, but no doubt existing). Χορὸν διδάσκειν, τραγῳδῶν διδάσκειν are both idiomatic, just as in English we can 'teach' both a class and a lesson. The spelling of these words and of κωμικοποιητής is established by the metre in Ar. *Eg.* 507, 516: *Pax* 734, 737, and so with τρυγωδοποιουμένη in a fragment of the other *Theophrastus*. But metre is not decisive as to τραγωδοῖς in *Thest.* 30 or κωμικοδοιχῶν in *Vesp.* 1318, and in good Plato MSS. the spelling of both τραγῳδ(ι)οῖς and κωμῳδ(ι)οῖς varies. The forms in *io* are favoured by analogy, for the first part of words in -οῖς usually gives the thing made, e.g. ἐποῖς, ἀλκοῖς: but the grammarian Moeris says Κωμικοποιοὶ Ἀττικῶς· κωμικοποιοὶ Ἑλληνικῶς, and κωμικογράφος, as against the usual κωμικογράφος and τραγικογράφος, is guaranteed by metre in *Anth.* P. 7. 708, ascribed to Dioscorides.

<sup>2</sup> Compare κισσαροῖς, αὐλοῖς, μελωδοῖς, βαρυδοῖς and any other such words. Α βαρυδοῖς might compose his own verses, a κισσαροῖς his own verses and music accompanying, but this is in no way conveyed by the name, which only connotes the performance.

tragic performance,' 'at the new tragedies.' Τραγωδοῖς cannot signify simply the men. It must mean the time and place at which they appear, their appearance, their performance, just as in Latin a thing is said to happen *gladiatoribus*, that is at the appearance of the gladiators, at the gladiatorial shows (Cic. *Phil.* 1, 15, 36, *ad Att.* 1. 16. 11 parallel with *ludis*, and elsewhere).<sup>3</sup> When καινοῖς is added, this is still clearer. To whom or what in a tragic performance was the word *new* properly applicable? Not to any of the performers, nor to the poets, for poets, actors, and many of the choreutae would probably be old hands. What was new was the performance itself, the plays they performed, and the phrase means really *when new tragedies are played*. So κωμικοῖς, which is much rarer, in the decree of a deme (*C.I.A.* I. 585) ordering a crown to be proclaimed κωμικοῖς. Compare the terms of the law given in the *Midias* 10 ὅταν ἡ πομπὴ ᾗ...καὶ οἱ κωμικοῖ

<sup>3</sup> In Greek we may compare the datives ζευγυρίοις, νοτίοις, βορείοις (Ar. *Hist. An.* 9. 28, 2: 6. 19. 4: 8. 12. 10), meaning at the time of such and such a wind, when it is blowing, and the genitives ἀππλιώτου, βορέου in Thuc. 3. 23, 5: in Latin Virg. *Aen.* 9. 668 *pluvialisbus Haedis*, Juv. 9. 68 *aquilone Decembri*, Tac. *Ann.* 3. 28. 3 *paci et principi*. Perhaps we may add Ar. *Eg.* 410 ἡ μὴ ποτ' ἀγοραίου Διὸς σπλάγχχνος παραγενόμεν, for a man cannot in strictness of speech be present at the σπλάγχχνα, but only at the doing of something to them. Λαμπάς, συνωρίς, etc. are used as names of contests, e.g. λαμπάδα τρίχειν, τῇ λαμπάδι τῶν παίδων, ἐτέθη συνωρίς. Less similar but not wholly alien is the use of plural names, e.g. ἰχθύες, λάχανα for the fish or vegetable market, the place where these things are sold. There is also clear affinity to the point we are illustrating in that common Latin and occasional Greek construction, by which a substantive or pronoun with a participle stands for something done to or by the subject in question. Thus παρήσαν παροῦντι αὐτῷ (Antiphon 4. 1. 7) is perhaps in essence the same as σπλάγχχνος παραγενέσθαι. Aesch. *Pers.* 728 ναυτικός στρατὸς κακῶς περὶν ὤλεσε στρατὸν: Herod. 8. 131 τοὺς δὲ Ἕλληνας τό τε ἐὼρ γιγνόμενον ἤγειρε καὶ Μαρδόνιος ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ ἰών are good examples of a large class. The best English parallel that occurs to me is the university slang by which we put e.g. 'the Rights' for the races in which boats so named take part; 'the Rights are over,' 'I saw him at last year's Rights.' Like τραγῳδοί, the boats stand for the performance, and the expression is at once local and temporal. College boards sometimes bear the notice 'there will be no river to-day': those who read it understand not that there will be no water in the river, but that the college boat will not go out. 'River' stands for 'practice on the river.' So 'the Old Masters' are (an exhibition of pictures by) the Old Masters: 'is there to be an Old Masters this year?' 'The Christy Minstrels' is at least half a place or performance. 'Punch and Judy,' 'a Punch and Judy,' is a performance; sometimes perhaps the men and things necessary for it. There are very many such instances to be collected, were it worth while.

καὶ οἱ τραγωδοὶ κ.τ.λ. in which οἱ τραγωδοὶ and οἱ κωμικοὶ signify like ἡ πομπή not men but something that men do. So in Aeschines in *Tim.* 157 ἐν τοῖς κατ' ἀγροῦς Διονυσίοις κωμικῶν ὄντων ἐν Κολλυτῷ: in *Ctes.* 41 γιγνομένων τῶν ἐν ἄστει τραγῶδων and 154 μελλόντων ὥσπερ νυνὶ τῶν τραγῶδων γίνεσθαι: it is not the men that γίνονται but their performance. Add in *Ctes.* 34 τραγῶδων ἀγωνιζομένων καινῶν (so *Plut. Mor.* 710 F), where as before καινῶν is not applicable to the men themselves. But *ib.* 204 μελλόντων τραγῶδων εἰσέναι: *Dem.* 5. 7 εἰ γὰρ ἐν Διονύσου τραγῶδους ἐθεῖσθε: *Xen. Oecon.* 3. 7 ἐπὶ μὲν κωμικῶν θέαν and 9 θεᾶ γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἥπερ τοὺς τραγῶδους τε καὶ κωμικοὺς: *Plut. Vit. Phoc.* 19 θεωμένων καινοὺς τραγῶδους Ἀθηναίων something of the personal force may possibly remain.

Harpocration and Suidas preserve a proverbial expression and its explanation. Τοὺς ἑτέρους τραγῶδους ἀγωνιέται. Λυκούργος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Δημάδην. Διδυμὸς φησιν ὅτι παροιμία ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρμοζομένων πρὸς τὰ ἐπιόντα καὶ σεμνοποιούντων ἑαυτοῦς. Here τραγῶδους means a performance so distinctly that it is actually made to depend on ἀγωνιζεσθαι, as ἀγῶνα might: οἱ ἑτέροι τραγῶδοὶ is the next performance just as οἱ καινοὶ τραγῶδοὶ is the new performance.

3. We turn now to a group of phrases of which χορηγεῖν τραγῶδους may be taken as the type, illustrated by the following passages:

*Lys.* 19. 29 τραγῶδους δις χορηγήσαι: 21. 1 καταστάς χορηγὸς τραγῶδους: 2 ἀνδράσι χορηγῶν εἰς Διονύσια... καὶ ἐπὶ Διοκλέους Παναθηναίοις τοῖς μικροῖς κυκλικῷ χορῷ (i.e. χορηγῶν), 4 κατέστην χορηγὸς παιδικῷ χορῷ: 24. 9 κατασταθείς χορηγὸς τραγῶδους. *Isaeus* 5, 36 τῇ μὲν φυλῇ εἰς Διονύσια χορηγήσας τέταρτος ἐγένετο τραγῶδους καὶ πυρριχισταῖς ὕστατος: 6, 60 κεχορήγηκε δὲ τραγῶδους, γεγυμνασιώρηκε δὲ λαμπάδι; and again χορηγεῖ μὲν τραγῶδους: 7, 40 παιδικῷ χορῷ χορηγῶν ἐνίκησεν. *Dem.* 21, 59 τοῦτον ἐμισθώσατό τις φιλόνομος χορηγὸς τραγῶδων, 156 τραγῶδους κεχορήγηκε. *Ar. Eth.* 4. 2. 20 κωμικοὺς χορηγῶν. *Frugm.* (I) 630, (587) χορηγεῖν τὰ Διονύσια τοῖς τραγῶδοις καὶ κωμικοῖς. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 56, 3 χορηγοὺς τραγῶδους καθίστησι τρεῖς... πρότερον δὲ καὶ κωμικοὺς καθίστηεν πέντε... ἔπειτα παραλαβὼν τοὺς χορηγοὺς τοὺς ἐνηγεμένους ὑπὸ τῶν φυλῶν εἰς Διονύσια ἀνδράσιν καὶ παισὶν καὶ κωμικοῖς κ.τ.λ. cf. *Plut.* (I) *Moralia* 835 B ἐχορήγησε κυκλικῷ χορῷ τῇ αὐτοῦ φυλῇ ἀγωνιζομένη διθυράμβῳ.

As to the expression χορηγεῖν τραγῶδους there are two questions to ask.

A. Are we to take τραγῶδους as a *dativus commodi* or as the dative of time and place above explained? The former view of it seems

strongly supported by *Lys.* 21, 2 and 4 and the language throughout of the passage in *Ἀθ. Πολ.*, by the genitive in *Dem.* 21, 59, and in a less degree by *Lys.* 21. 1 and 24, 9, since in the latter places τραγῶδους cannot logically give a sort of date for καταστάς and κατασταθείς, as the appointment was not made at the performance but before it. In the phrase τῇ φυλῇ χορηγεῖν (e.g. *Isaeus*, 5, 36 above) φυλῇ must be a *dativus commodi*. There would seem, however, to be no reason why τραγῶδους in χορηγεῖν τραγῶδους etc. should not also have had a local or temporal meaning sometimes, e.g. in *Isaeus* 6, 60. The analysis of the dative need not always be the same. Sometimes again e.g. *ib.* 7, 40 the dative may be instrumental with the verb νικᾶν. In *Plat. Apol.* 36 D εἰ τις ἑμὸν ἵππῳ ἢ ξυνωρίδι ἢ ζεύγει νενίκηκεν this is the most obvious way of taking the datives, though they may also like τραγῶδους be a short expression for a contest or performance and therefore in reality local or temporal. So λαμπάδι is either 'with a torch' or—and this seems the truer account—'in the torch race,' a meaning that λαμπάς certainly bears. Such expressions therefore as [*Andoc.*] 4. 42 νενικηκώς εὐανδρία καὶ λαμπάδι καὶ τραγῶδους: *Theophr. Char.* 22 νικήσας τραγῶδους: are not clear.

B. If and when τραγῶδους is a *dativus commodi* and therefore a name for persons, are these persons performers or poets? *Lys.* 21, 2 and 4, *Isaeus* 5, 36 and 7, 40, and the *Ἀθ. Πολ.* show that they are performers, just as in those passages ἀνδράσι, χορῷ, πυρριχισταῖς, χορῷ, ἀνδράσιν καὶ παισὶν signify performers. And that the performers in question are the chorus, not the actors, appears from the fact that the choregus was concerned with the chorus and in an ordinary way had nothing to do with the actors. They received nothing from him. He was not choregus of or for them.

4. I take the following inscription as exemplifying a third group of phrases in which τραγῶδοὶ and κωμικοὶ appear: ἐπὶ Φιλοκλέους Οἰνήτις παίδων, Δημόδοκος ἐχορήγει. Ἰπποθωντὶς ἀνδρῶν, Εὐκτῆμων Ἐλευσίνιος ἐχορήγει. κωμικῶν Εὐρυκλείδης ἐχορήγει, Εὐφρόνιος ἐδίδασκε. τραγῶδων Ξενοκλῆς Ἀφιδναῖος ἐχορήγει, Αἰσχύλος ἐδίδασκεν (*C.I.A.* 4. p. 218). Cf. the inscriptions cited in Haigh's *Attic Theatre* App. B. 1 and the Greek argument of the *Persae*: ἐπὶ Μένωνος τραγῶδων Αἰσχύλος ἐνίκη Φινεί, Πέρσαις, Γλαῦκῳ Ποτνεί, Προμηθεῖ. It is by no means clear what is the construction of the genitives ἀνδρῶν, παίδων, κωμικῶν, τραγῶδων, nor do I understand the view of Meisterhaus 82 c 18, but I should

suggest that Οἰνῆς παίδων stands for Οἰνῆς παίδων χορῶ ἐνίκα. This seems supported by various victory and votive records, taking three main forms, which may be briefly illustrated from *C.I.A.* 2, 3, 1229-1299. The whole section will repay examination.

A. 1242 Ἀνσικράτης Ἀνσιθείδων Κικυννεὺς ἐχορήγει. Ἀκαμαντὶς παίδων ἐνίκα. cf. 1235, 1238, 1244 &c. B. 1236 Αἴσιος Μνησιβούλου Σφήττιος χορηγῶν ἐνίκα Ἀκαμαντίδι Πανδιονίδι παίδων. cf. 1234, 1237, 1251 &c. C. 1247 Θράσυλλος Θρασύλλου Δεκελεὺς ἀνέθηκεν χορηγῶν νικήσας ἀνδράσιν Ἰπποθωντίδι φυλῇ. 1248 Διόδωρος Ἐξηκεστίδου νικήσας χορῶ παίδων. 1283 Δημοστράτου νικήσας ἀνέθηκε [κυκλίῳ] χορῶ καὶ κωμωδοῖς.

It is possible and even probable that such a genitive as that in Οἰνῆς παίδων came to be used without much thought of construction and of what was to be supplied. But there must originally have been something on which the genitive was understood to depend, and it seems perhaps most likely to have been χορῶ, though it may also have been ἀγῶν (see Haigh, *Tragic Drama* p. 445 note). By analogy, when we come to κωμωδῶν and τραγῶδων further on in the inscription we must again supply some case of χορός. With ἐχορήγει it would naturally be the dative, but this time a *dativus commodi*: with εἶδασκε the accusative.

This point is, however, beside my main argument as to the persons of whom τραγῶδοί and κωμῶδοί are names. Whatever the precise analysis of these phrases, the fact remains that τραγῶδοί and κωμῶδοί are parallel to ἄνδρες and παῖδες and therefore the words connote *performers*, not *poets*. There is, however, nothing in this particular group of formulae, as there was in the last, to prevent anyone holding if he likes that the performers in question are the *actors*, not the *singers*. That must be settled by other considerations.

We have seen then (1) that τραγῶδοί and κωμῶδοί came to be used as the name of a *performance*: (2) that in such phrases as χορηγεῖν τραγῶδοῖς the dative probably means *for a tragic chorus*, though it may be *at the tragedies*: (3) that τραγῶδοί and κωμῶδοί in the passages last examined certainly mean *performers* and presumably the *chorus* as before.

5. We go on to an extension of the use of the words as a name for performances, an extension in which the circumstances of time and place fall into the background or practically disappear, and the words come in degrees varying according to the nature of the passage to mean *the tragic and comic*

*stage, tragedy and comedy*. Tragedy and comedy are still, perhaps, thought of as heard and seen rather than read. So much still survives of the force first belonging to the words as names of performers. *Tragic stage* therefore will often give the idea better than *tragedy*. It is in some of the passages yielding this sense that by a natural misunderstanding it has been easiest to take the words as meaning *poets*.

Before dwelling on this I will put together the chief literary passages, not already quoted, belonging to the 5th or 4th century and containing τραγῶδός or κωμῶδός, with some of later date and two or three in which we find τραγῶδοί, a word exactly parallel to the other two. The passages do not all exhibit the sense of which I am just now especially speaking, but it is convenient to have them all under the eye at once.

Aristoph.—

*Vesp.* 650 χαλεπὸν μὲν καὶ δεινὴς γνώμης καὶ μείζονος ἢ πῖ τραγῶδοῖς κ.τ.λ.

1480 καὶ τοὺς τραγῶδούς φησιν ἀποδείξειν κρίνοντας τοὺς νῦν διορχησάμενος ὀλίγον ὕστερον.

1498 εἴ τις τραγῶδός φησιν ὀρχεῖσθαι καλῶς.

1505 ἕτερος τραγῶδός Καρκινίτης ἔρχεται.

1537 τοῦτο γὰρ οὐδέεις πω πάρος δέδρακεν ὀρχοῦμενον ὅστις ἀπ᾽ ἡλλαξεν χορὸν τραγῶδων.

*Pax.* 530 Διονυσίων, αὐλῶν, τραγῶδων, Σοφοκλέους μελῶν, κιχλῶν.

806 ἦνίκα τῶν τραγῶδων τὸν χορὸν εἶχον ἀδελφός τε καὶ αὐτός.

*Av.* 512 ὅπότε ἐξέλθοι Πριάμος τις ἔχων ὄρνιν ἐν τοῖσι τραγῶδοῖς.

787 εἶτα πενῶν τοῖς χοροῖσι τῶν τραγῶδων ἤχθετο.

*Thesm.* 390 ὅπου περ ἔμβραχυν εἰσὶν θεαταὶ καὶ τραγῶδοί (†) καὶ χοροί.

*Thyr. fragm.* 1. 8:

A. καὶ τίνες ἂν εἴεν; B. πρῶτα μὲν Σαννυρίων ἀπὸ τῶν τραγῶδων, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν τραγικῶν χορῶν Μέλητος, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κυκλίων Κινησίας.

Crates (*Mein.* 2. 242: *Kock.* 1. 138) τοῖς δὲ τραγῶδοῖς ἕτερος σεμνὸς πᾶσιν λόγος ἄλλος ὁδ' ἔστιν.

Phrynichus wrote a comedy called *Τραγῶδοι*. We know nothing as to its nature. [Plays called *κωμωδοτραγωδία* are attributed to three comic poets (Mein. l. 247), but it is not clear how far this is a proper, how far a generic, name.]

Timocles (M. 3. 593 : K. 2. 453)—

τοὺς γὰρ τραγῶδους πρῶτον, εἰ βούλει, σκόπει  
ὡς ὠφελούσι πάντας.

Philemon (M. 4. 44 : K. 2. 512)—

τὰ δ' ἀργυρώματ' ἐστὶν ἢ τε πορφύρα  
εἰς τοὺς τραγῶδους εὖθετ', οὐκ εἰς τὸν βίον.  
χρήσιμ',

Diphilus (M. 4. 388 : K. 2. 549)—

ὡς οἱ τραγῶδοι φασιν οἷς ἐξουσία  
ἐστὶν λέγειν ἅπαντα καὶ ποιεῖν μόνους.

Plato *Rep.* 395 A. ἀλλ' οὐδέ τοι ἔποκρται  
κωμῶδοις τε καὶ τραγῶδοις οἱ αὐτοί.

*Phaedr.* 236 C. ἵνα δὲ μὴ τὸ τῶν  
κωμῶδων φορτικὸν πρᾶγμα ἀναγ-  
καζώμεθα ποιεῖν ἀνταποδιδόντες  
ἀλλήλοις.

*Leges* 935 D. τὴν τῶν κωμῶδων προ-  
θυμίαν τοῦ γελοῖα εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους  
λέγειν.

Aristot. *Poet.* 5. 1449 b 1. καὶ γὰρ χορὸν  
κωμῶδων ὅψε ποτε ὁ ἄρχων ἔδωκεν. 22. 1458  
b 34. Ἀριφράδης τοὺς τραγῶδους ἐκωμῶδει, ὅτι  
ἂ οὐδεὶς ἂν εἴποι ἐν τῇ διαλέκτῳ τούτοις χρώνται.

[Aristot.] *Oec.* 1. 4. 1344 a 20. ἡ δὲ διὰ τῆς  
κοσμῆσεως οὐδὲν διαφέρουσά ἐστι τῆς τῶν  
τραγῶδων ἐν τῇ σκεπῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὁμιλίαν.

Diodor. 4. 56. 1. καθόλου δὲ διὰ τὴν τῶν  
τραγῶδων τερατεῖαν ποικιλὴ τις καὶ διάφορος  
ἱστορία περὶ Μηδείας ἐξενήνκεται.

Dionys. Hal. *de. vet. script.* 2. 11 τῶν δὲ  
κωμῶδων μιμεῖται (i.e. Euripides), τὰς λεκτικὰς  
ἀρμονίας.

Dion Chrys. 13. 224 τραγῶδους ἐκάστοτε  
ὁρᾶτε τοῖς Διονυσίοις. 21. 272 τὸ μὴ πάνυ  
φιλεῖν τοὺς τραγῶδους μὴδὲ ζηλοῦν.

Lucian *Herm.* 86 τὸ τῶν τραγῶδων τοῦτο,  
θεὸς ἐκ μηχανῆς ἐπιφανείς.

*Tox.* 9 ὅπότεν ὑμῖν οἱ τραγῶδοι τὰς  
τοιαύτας φιλίας ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν  
ἀναβιβάσαντες δεικνύουσιν. cf.  
*Iupp. Trag.* 41.

*Anach.* 22 τοῖς δέ γε κωμῶδοις καὶ  
ἀποσκοπτεῖν καὶ λοιδορεῖσθαι ἐφέ-  
μεν ἐς τοὺς πολίτας.

Zeus τραγῶδός is the name of a  
well-known dialogue.

Pollux 5. 97 ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ παρὰ τοῖς κωμῶδοις  
καὶ ἐγκλαστρίδια κ.τ.λ. But cf. *ib.* 101 and  
6. 18.

When Ar. *Av.* 512 speaks of Priam  
appearing ἐν τοῖς τραγῶδοις, the editors  
rightly explain this as = ἐν ταῖς τραγωδίαις.  
We must not however suppose that it means  
literally 'in the tragic poets,' as we might  
say that Richard III appears 'in Shakspeare.'  
'En is never used thus in good Greek: even  
the use of παρά with a dative of the author's  
name seems to be later. Τραγῶδοι are still  
the performers standing for what they  
perform; 'on the tragic stage.' Equally  
clear, perhaps clearer, is the use in Philemon.  
If τοὺς τραγῶδους meant the persons to whom  
the things were serviceable, we should have  
had τοῖς τραγῶδοις, not εἰς τοὺς τραγῶδους.  
This passage deserves special notice, as it  
lends itself very easily to misconception and  
yet certainly cannot mean even 'for the  
purposes of tragic poets,' but only 'in  
application to tragic performers,' 'for  
tragedy.' No one will contend that εἰς σὲ  
χρήσιμα could mean 'useful to you' or 'for  
your purposes': it could only be 'useful to  
somebody else as regards you.' The antithesis  
of εἰς τὸν βίον further points the meaning.

In the light of these two passages and  
after what has been said above we can have  
no difficulty in dealing with the comic  
fragments and the passages from *Phaedrus*,  
*Laws*, *Poetics* 22, Diodorus, Dionysius, Dion  
Chrysostom, and Lucian. In not one of  
them is there any reason for thinking that  
τραγῶδοι and κωμῶδοι mean specifically poets;  
it is still the performers standing for their  
plays, their tragic or comic stage.<sup>1</sup> But a  
few places may be mentioned separately.

Commenting on Plat. *Rep.* 395 A, Ast in  
his *Lexicon Platonicum* takes κωμῶδοι and  
τραγῶδοι by an odd oversight, perhaps only  
a clerical error, for actors. In such a con-  
text this is manifestly impossible, and the  
words are usually (I imagine) understood  
to mean that tragic and comic poets employ  
different actors. But we can now see that  
the words may quite well mean (1) that  
tragedy and comedy have different actors,

<sup>1</sup> The use of σάτυροι for a satyric play is partly  
parallel. See Ar. *Thesm.* 157 δταν σατύρους τοῖσιν  
ποιῆς, καλεῖν ἐμέ : C.I.G. 1. 1584 ποιητῆς σατύρων  
along with ποιητῆς τραγῶδιων and ποιητῆς κωμῶδιων  
(for other cases in inscriptions cf. A. Müller, *Griech.*  
*Bühnenall.* p. 391, n. 4); Strabo 60 Ἴων ἐν Ὀμφάλῳ  
σατύροις : Athen. 407 F ἐν Ἰκαρίοις σατύροις : *ib.* 420  
A γράψας σατύρους Μενέδημον with Diog. L. 2. 140 :  
arg. *Meleia* Θερισταῖς σατύροις : Suidas s.v. Πρατίνης-  
πρῶτος ἔγραψε σατύρους : Horace *A.P.* 235 satyrorum  
scriptor. Hence σατυρογράφος. Like τραγῶδοι,  
σάτυροι is the name of the chorus (from whom a  
Greek play so often took its name), but τραγῶδοι  
connotes the performers, σάτυροι the characters per-  
formed. Once or twice it is the singular σάτυρος  
which is used : e.g. C.I.G. 2758 IV. and Demetr.  
Π. ἐρμ. 169 σάτυρον γράψας ἀντὶ τραγωδίας.



or (2) that there are different actors at tragic and comic performances. Our choice of interpretations is like that we have with regard to χορηγεῖν τραγῳδοῖς.

In Ar. *Vesp.* 650 τραγῳδοῖς is simply comedy: in the fragment of the *Gerytades* τῶν τραγῳδῶν are either again comedy, the comic stage, or strictly parallel with the χορῶν that follows and used of the singers, the chorus.

The lines *Vesp.* 1537, *Pax* 806, *Av.* 787, though of a different kind, have been misunderstood in the same way. In all three, certainly in the first and third, the words have been understood of poets, but there is not the slightest occasion for this in any of them. In all three the words are closely connected with χορός and describe the persons of whom the χορός consisted, as in χορὸς παίδων, χορὸς παιδικός above cited and probably in the παίδων, etc., of the inscriptions (Οἰνῆς παίδων). To these three passages join that from *Poetics* 5, which presents no difficulty. The χορηγὸς τραγῳδῶν of Dem. 21, 59 may be recalled in this connexion. It cannot mean choregus of tragic poets, because each choregus was associated with one poet only, nor is the relation of choregus to poet ever expressed (as far as I know) by such a genitive. The τραγῳδοί are almost certainly the chorus, whose choregus the man was, though it is just possible that the word may mean here of tragedy. In the Parian Marble, 54, κομω[δῶν χο]ρ[ὸς] ἥρ[η]θη is only conjectural.

There remain a few passages still to be considered. In Ar. *Thesm.* 391, if the text is right, τραγῳδοί and χοροί seem to be distinguished from each other. But the scholium to Plato, *Theages*, 127 c, quotes it as θεαταὶ καὶ τραγῳδικοὶ χοροί, and this reading has been adopted by several editors, including Velsen. Cf. *Ach.* 886 ποθεινὴ μὲν τραγῳδικαῖς χοροῖς: *Lysias*, 21, 4 παιδικῷ χορῷ. In three passages of the *Vespae* (1480, 1498, 1505) τραγῳδός is used with special reference to dancing. Although Carcinus and one at least of his sons here introduced were writers of tragedy, it is clear that τραγῳδός does not refer to that, but is still the name of a choreutes, not small part of whose professional business was dancing. There is no reason why Philocleon should challenge tragic poets to dance. He challenges the trained dancers. Photius 598, 4 records for us that Aristophanes used the verb τραγῳδεῖν = χορεύειν. Cf. the glosses in Hesychius: τραγῳδία: χορεία, κομῳδία and τραγῳδός: χορευτής, κομῳδός; in which we ought perhaps to

read τραγῳδία and τραγῳδός. Χορεύειν is seldom, if ever, used with regard to choral song. In *Pax* 530 the sense of τραγῳδῶν is indeterminate, but αἰλῶν and μελῶν help to indicate it.

Let us take last the passage of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Oeconomics*. Here, if in any place discussed so far, τραγῳδοί seems so used as to apply to actors, not indeed expressly, but taken along with the singers under a general expression. The other words hardly admit of our making it here the performance. τραγῳδοί must be the performers, and when we consider the sense we cannot very well exclude the actors, who have most of the ὁμιλία πρὸς ἀλλήλους. It seems to me that in this place the word is used confusedly and applies to actors and chorus together. I say 'confusedly,' because I think the writer had first in his mind the idea of οἱ τραγῳδοί = the tragic stage, with which sense the words πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὁμιλία are not in strict logic consistent. Be it remembered that we do not know when this sentence was written, or whether the writer was an Athenian and fully master of the delicacies of Attic speech.

It ought to be pointed out here that the verbs τραγῳδῶ, κομῳδῶ are used without the limitations of the nouns. Thus in Ar. *Thesm.* 85 Euripides the poet is made to say οὕτῃ τραγῳδῶ καὶ κακῶς αὐτὰς λέγω; and in *Nub.* 1091 τί δαί; τραγῳδοῦσ' ἐκ τίνων; the parallel of συνηγοροῦσιν and δημηγοροῦσιν suggests that it is poets who τραγῳδοῦσιν. It is Euripides, not his choreutae or actors, that Aristophanes is pretending to attack. The scholiast, however, followed by Meineke, 1, 149, refers it to choreutae. So too Aristophanes uses κομῳδῶ of himself, the poet: *Ach.* 631 ὅς κομῳδεῖ τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν δῆμον καθυβρίζει: *ib.* 655 κομῳδήσει τὰ δίκαια: *Pax* 751 οὐκ ἰδιώτας ἀνθρωπιστικούς κομῳδῶν οὐδὲ γυναῖκας. For other uses of the two verbs, sometimes in a derivative and not dramatic sense, see *Plutus* 557: [*Xen.*] *R.A.* 2, 18: *Plat. Rep.* 395 ε and 452 δ: *Ar. Poet.* 22, 1458 b, 34; *Dem.* 18, 13 and 19, 189.

6. Our result so far is this: The evidence that in Attic of this date the words were ever used of poets is absolutely nil, and the evidence for their having been used distinctly of actors is practically nil too. *Thesm.* 391 and *Oecon.* 1, 4 are the only passages that lend any colour to the latter theory.

If from other Attic evidence we knew with certainty that the words sometimes



bore the meanings in question, we might consider the propriety of taking them so in a very few of the passages above given. The utmost which can really be said is that a few passages admit of such a meaning, supposing the possibility of it to be established otherwise. For instance, in Crates, Diphilus, Timocles, Plato, Aristotle *Poetics* 22, οἱ τραγῳδοὶ might be poets, if there were independent and conclusive evidence that the word ever bore that meaning. But it has been shown that other well-established usages fully and naturally explain the passages in question, and that no such meaning is in any degree needed for them. To establish the sense of poet or actor, what we want is some passage where no other explanation is plausible or possible, whereas we have seen that in all those above cited another sense is quite satisfactory. Are there any passages, such as will be quoted shortly from different sources, where a specific author, e.g. Euripides, or a specific actor, e.g. Theodorus, is spoken of as τραγῳδός or κωμῳδός? If any such can be found, it will need the most careful consideration, but no number of passages proves anything in which the words can quite well be ranged under another use. I should be very sorry to say confidently that I have not overlooked some occurrence of the words. Our lexica and indices are as yet so imperfect that this is very likely to have happened. I will only say that I know of no passage in which either of the alleged senses is to be found, and will ask other scholars to supply any omission of which I have been guilty.

7. It is very significant in this matter that in literature the words hardly ever occur in the singular. They are almost always in the plural. If, as I have argued, they mean (1) singers, in most cases forming a chorus, acting and spoken of together, (2) a performance, (3) tragedy or the tragic stage, comedy or the comic stage, the two latter meanings being derived directly from the first, it is natural that they should generally appear in the plural. If however a single actor or poet could be so called, why do we not find the singular occurring in the sense? An actor, a poet, is mentioned often enough, but never by this designation. In good Attic Greek I can cite for the singular τραγῳδός only the two passages *Vesp.* 1498 and 1505; and a fragment of Menander (M. 4. 300: K. 3. 231) τραγῳδός ἦν ἀγὼν Διονύσια, where τραγῳδός would be an adjective and τραγῳδῶν conjectured.

8. We have now to consider some evidence

which may very probably be thought to show that *outside Attica* the words could be used in the sense of tragic and comic actors. It consists mainly in inscriptions relating to festivals at which, though they were not Dionysiac, performances of a dramatic nature took place along with others. We will begin with two that appear in Böckh's *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* No. 1584 (Vol. 1), relating to the Charitesia at Orchomenus and dated by Böckh about 200 B.C., gives a list of victors by their own names and professional designations. The names may be omitted here as immaterial. The professional designations are as follows: οἶδε ἐνίκων τὸν ἀγὼνα τῶν Χαριτησίων σάλπιστής, κήρυξ, ῥαψῳδός, ποιητὴς ἐπὶν, αὐλητής, αὐλωδός, κιθαριστής, κιθαρωδός, τραγῳδός, κωμῳδός, ποιητὴς σατύρων, ὑποκριτής, ποιητὴς τραγῳδιῶν, ὑποκριτής, ποιητὴς κωμῳδιῶν, ὑποκριτής.

No. 1585, relating to another Boeotian festival and belonging to imperial times, enumerates in like manner (after some others that it is unnecessary to give here) ῥαψῳδός, πνθαύλας, κιθαριστάς, τραγῳδός, παλαιὰς τραγῳδίας, ποιητὴς καινῆς κωμῳδίας, ὑποκριτής καινῆς κωμῳδίας, ποιητὴς καινῆς τραγῳδίας, ὑποκριτής καινῆς τραγῳδίας, χοραύλης, νεαρωδός, σατυρογράφος, διὰ πάντων. In this Böckh plausibly supposed that between the third and fourth victors a κωμῳδός παλαιὰς κωμῳδίας has been accidentally omitted. In the first of these records the τραγῳδός and κωμῳδός (each in the singular) are clearly distinct from the various ὑποκριταὶ mentioned subsequently, as they are from the poets. In the second the τραγῳδός παλαιὰς τραγῳδίας is distinguished from the ὑποκριτής καινῆς τραγῳδίας, and, if we adopt Böckh's suggestion, there would also be a distinction between κωμῳδός παλαιὰς κωμῳδίας and ὑποκριτής καινῆς κωμῳδίας.

We may place here a third inscription (965 in Rangabé's *Antiq. Hell.*), relating to the Amphiaraea at Oropus and referred by Rangabé to almost Roman times. In this after some other competitors we find ποιητὴς σατύρων, τραγῳδός, κωμῳδός, ποιητὴς τραγῳδίας, ποιητὴς κωμῳδίας, ἐπινίκιον, &c., but, written small at the side so as to be associated with ποιητὴς τραγῳδίας and ποιητὴς κωμῳδίας respectively, ὑποκριτής with a name is twice added. Τραγῳδός and κωμῳδός are therefore again distinguished from ὑποκριτής.

It is well known that Böckh founded on inscriptions such as these his theory of 'lyrical tragedy,' supposing τραγῳδός in the first inscription to be the same as τραγῳδός παλαιὰς τραγῳδίας in the second, and taking παλαιὰ τραγῳδία to be an older type

of tragedy, lyrical in character, in which new plays continued to be composed. The records since found at Athens (*C.I.A.* 1. 973: see Haigh *Attic Theatre* pp. 99 and 395), in which *παλαιὰ τραγῳδία* indisputably means only a tragedy that might be called old at the date in question, e.g. the *Orestes* of Euripides in 340 B.C., have thrown very great doubts on this, and it had been much questioned even before. Cf. also the statement preserved in Bekker's *Anecdota* 1. 309 τῶν τραγῳδῶν οἱ μὲν ἦσαν παλαιοί, οἱ παλαιὰ δράματα εἰσαγαγόντες, οἱ δὲ καινοὶ οἱ καινὰ καὶ μῦθέστε εἰσενεχθέντα. It is indeed obvious that the very phrase *καινοὶ τραγῳδοὶ* above examined implies an antithesis to something that might be called *παλαιόν*. Lüders (*Dionysische Künstler* p. 129), A. Müller (*Griech. Bühnenalt.* p. 387), and Haigh (*Tragic Drama* p. 447 n. 7) agree that in these inscriptions *τραγῳδός* is a protagonist who made himself responsible for the production of an old play. They do not however explain why in these cases the actor is called not *ὑποκριτής* but *τραγῳδός* or *κωμῳδός*. Even if the latter words were in use for actors, there must be some reason why in the same inscriptions certain performers are formally styled *ὑποκριτής* and certain others *τραγῳδός* or *κωμῳδός*. It is no explanation to say that the actor who brought out an old play (or part of it) was called *τραγῳδός*. Why was he called so? As we have seen that in good Attic the words appear not to have been used of actors, it becomes still more probable that the difference of name followed some difference of kind in the performance.

May not the words, as used in these and some other places, signify a performance by one or two people in which singing was paramount? We know how much there was of this even for actors from early times. The *kommoi* properly so called and other commatic scenes are a marked feature in all three tragic poets. Monodies, though they did not begin with Euripides, are prominent in his plays and form the subject of an amusing parody in the *Frogs*. Cf. *Pax* 1012: *Thesm.* 1077. It is plain that these monodies became very important in the later tragedy. Why should not solos, duets, trios have been the performances to which the names *τραγῳδός* and *κωμῳδός* sometimes refer? What had once been the part of the chorus, when a play e.g. of Euripides was first brought out, might often in single scenes be quite well taken by one voice. Monodies apart, we can find plenty of lyrical or semi-lyrical passages in extant plays that

might be picked out for performance in this way, just as in our theatres on benefit nights and others bits of many plays are often given. Such would be the great Cassandra scene in the *Agamemnon*, the *kommos* in the *Antigone*, Phaedra and her nurse in the *Hippolytus*. As actors sometimes recited famous speeches, so songs and whole lyrical scenes from old plays may sometimes have been given, and of course new solos and duets could also be composed. Some stories that have come down to us, e.g. that in Plutarch's *Lysander* of the song from the *Electra*, and what he tells us in *Nicias* about the lyrics of Euripides which the Athenians in Sicily were able to turn to account, may support this conjecture—I mean only as showing how popular such songs were. Songs from comedy might not be so easy to find, but some would certainly be forthcoming, and perhaps even anapaestic or trochaic passages might be included. The tragic lyrics or lyrical tragedies, which were so popular at Rome and elsewhere under the Empire and which will have to be mentioned again presently, would afford a good parallel for such a practice of reviving old or producing new monodies. A passage of Philostratus (*Vit. Apollon.* 4. 21) seems clearly to imply that such performances were at a later date familiar in Greek cities. Apollonius thought the Athenians went to the theatre *μονωδίας ἀκροασομένους καὶ μελοποιίας παραβιάσειν τε καὶ ῥυθμῶν, ὅπως κωμῳδίας τε καὶ τραγῳδίας εἰσὶν* and was disappointed to find they only went to see dancing. In much earlier times what are we to make of the lyrical dialogue between Aegaeus and another (?) person which forms the 18th (or 17th) poem of Bacchylides? It is exactly such a composition as I imagine two *τραγῳδοὶ* may have sung, and for some such purpose it must have been composed.

If this practice existed, a *τραγῳδός* would not necessarily be a different person altogether from an actor. The same man might be called *τραγῳδός* and *ὑποκριτής* according to circumstances. The actor in an ordinary tragedy would sometimes have to sing monodies or bear a part in lyrical scenes. Perhaps even by this he became a *τραγῳδός*: still more, when he had little or nothing else than singing to do. We should not therefore be surprised, if the same man were spoken of by both names, and this would not prove that the names meant just the same thing. With us the same actor and actress may appear, or at any rate may have appeared, in both comedy and comic opera. Yet the two things are by no means the

same. Singing does not cease to be the characteristic feature of the one, though the same performer may make his appearance in the other.

We have to consider very carefully four interesting records of performances which took place at the Delphic festival known as Soteria. They were first published in Wescher and Foucart's *Inscriptions de Delphes* (Nos. 3-6): but may also be found elsewhere, e.g. in Lüders' *Dionysische Künstler*, p. 187, with a discussion of them beginning at p. 112, and the first of them is given in Dittenberger's *Sylloge* (404 in ed. 1: 691 in ed. 2, 1900), who now dates it not much after 270 B.C. They vary slightly in details but are very uniform and it will be enough to describe the first of them. I leave out, as before, the personal names, which are given all through, and only put down the style under which the various performers are enumerated. οἷδε ἡγωνίσαντο τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Σωτηρίων—ραψῳδοί 2, κιθαρισταί 2, κιθαρωδοί 2, παῖδες χορευταί 5, ἄνδρες χορευταί 5, αἰληταί 2, διδάσκαλοι 2, τραγωδοί 3, αἰλητής, διδάσκαλος, 3 more names (apparently τραγωδοί as no designation is given: so regularly) with αἰλητής and διδάσκαλος, 3 more names with αἰλητής and διδάσκαλος, κωμῳδοί 3 with αἰλητής (a διδάσκαλος has probably dropped out by accident), 3 more names with αἰλητής and διδάσκαλος, three more with the same, three more with the same, χορευταί κωμικοί 7, ἱματιομίσθαι 3. In two of the inscriptions the number of the παῖδες and ἄνδρες is much larger, 12 and 15. In the fourth an αἰλητής and διδάσκαλος are only recorded with 3 out of 9 κωμῳδοί. All four have 7 χορευταί κωμικοί: none any χορευταί τραγικοί.

At first sight we are disposed to say, as Lüders, Dittenberger, A. Müller, &c., do say, that the three τραγωδοί and the three κωμῳδοί are obviously the three actors of ordinary tragedy and comedy. Perhaps they are. But, when we examine the lists, we are struck by the fact that, with one or two exceptions, each set of three performers, tragic or comic, has its pipe-player and its teacher. The former is less noticeable, because an actor would probably need him now and then: it was however only for singing that he was wanted. The remarkable thing is that there was a teacher with each set of performers. As far as our information goes, I believe teachers are never mentioned in connexion with actors properly so called. We hear of them usually as teaching the chorus, that is they taught singing and dancing. The teachers of tragedy are such people as Sannio in the *Midias*, ὁ

τοὺς τραγικοὺς χοροὺς διδάσκων (58: cf. 59 πάντα τὸν μετὰ ταῦτα χρόνον διδάσκει τοὺς χοροὺς). Χοροδιδάσκαλος is a more explicit word for the same thing. There is no doubt that the dramatic sense of διδάσκειν came from the original sense of teaching the chorus. It is never used, so far as I know, (though Foucart de *Colleg. Scaen. Artif. apud Graecos*, p. 75, quietly assumes this to be the meaning of the word), of teaching actors who had simply to speak their parts. When then we find teacher and musician going along with every set of performers, does not the idea present itself that the performers were rather vocalists than actors proper? Perhaps it may be thought that, although only the actors are specified, there must have been dramatic choruses too, and that the teachers were for them. It is indeed difficult to understand how a complete play of the type known to us can have been performed without a chorus. The chorus could not be simply dropped out of any tragedy we have. But with regard to these Soteria records (1) the lists of performers appear complete, the names for instance of all those in the dithyrambic choruses being enumerated; (2) in each of them there actually is one set of seven χορευταί κωμικοί mentioned with their names, though no χορευταί τραγικοί are mentioned at all; (3) the critics above named agree in thinking no ordinary dramatic choruses to have appeared and the χορευταί κωμικοί to have been dancers.

With these Delphic records it is natural to associate the Amphictyonic decree found at Athens (*C.I.A.* 2. 551) guaranteeing safe-conduct, &c. to the 'artists,' i.e. οἱ περὶ Διόνυσον τεχνῖται, of Athens. There are mentioned in it πρέσβεις: Ἀστυδάμας ποιητής τραγωδίας,—μος τραγωδός. Astydamos, if it is the famous tragic poet of that name, carries us back well into the fourth century, and the τραγωδός has been plausibly thought to be Aristodemus, the Athenian actor contemporary with Demosthenes. This is the earliest example I have found of τραγωδός used in the singular of one performer, except the two lines of the *Wasps* above quoted in which it evidently refers to a χορευτής.

Other inscriptions in Lüders, pp. 183-186 afford a few examples of τραγωδός and κωμῳδός in the singular without (I think) throwing any light on our difficulty. *C.I.G.* 1845, referred by Böckh to the 2nd or 3rd century B.C. arranges for 3 αἰληταί, 3 τραγωδοί, and 3 κωμῳδοί to be supplied to Coreyra, and another in Le Bas (*Asie Min.* 281; also

Lüders, p. 181) for two of each kind to be sent to Iasos. Lüders and A. Müller suppose that in these cases the *τραγωδοί* and *κωμικοί* were three protagonists, accompanied by other actors and necessary persons like the 3 *ἀλχηταί* expressly mentioned, to appear in competition with each other. Each *τραγωδός* and *κωμικός* therefore would virtually stand for a company of performers. This is somewhat improbable in itself and necessitates a quite different interpretation from that of the Delphic decrees, where three *τραγωδοί* are certainly not understood to be three protagonists. How are we to explain the record in an Egyptian inscription (about 250 B.C.: *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* ix. 131) of one *τραγωδός*, six *κωμικοί*, and four *συναγωνισταί τραγικοί*? Some Delian inscriptions (*Bull. de Corr. Hell.* vii. 105: Dittenberger *Syll.*<sup>2</sup> 692) seem to give usually two *κωμικοί* and three *τραγωδοί*: once one *κωμικός*. For a few more references see A. Müller's *Griech. Bühnenalt.*, pp. 384-388.

If the view here suggested be correct, that *τραγωδός* did not for a long time lose its proper sense of *singer*, but that an actor might be called *τραγωδός* on particular occasions or with particular reference to any singing that came into his part, it may explain why the well-known actor Neoptolemus is called *Νεοπτόλεμος ὁ τραγωδός* in Diodorus 16, 92. So late a writer very possibly meant by the word only *actor*. But it is at least a curious coincidence that, when the word is used, Diodorus is about to quote those lyrical verses of sinister significance which the great actor sang before Philip of Macedon. Perhaps the passage that tells most strongly is one on the other side in which Athenaeus 538 F, following Chares of Mitylene who was a sort of chamberlain to Alexander and wrote memoirs, describes a great festivity given by the king. Many eminent performers of various kinds appeared at it; *ὑπεκρίθησαν δὲ τραγωδοὶ μὲν Θεσσαλὸς καὶ Ἀθηρόδωρος καὶ Ἀριστόκριτος, κωμικοὶ δὲ Λύκων καὶ Φορμίων καὶ Ἀρίστων*. It may no doubt be that these performances were rather a matter of singing than speaking, but some of the performers are known as actors, *ὑπεκρίθησαν* is used, and the presumption is the other way, especially when we compare Plut. *Alex.* 29, where the same well-known actors (*ὑποκριταί*) are mentioned in connexion with Alexander. A good deal turns on the question whether we have here the very words of Chares himself, or only the substance of them in the language of Athenaeus, whose use of *τραγωδός* for actor would not be noticeable. It must

be allowed that he seems to be quoting, but the point is not entirely clear, and elsewhere, when he seems to be quoting, his words are not always identical with the words of our texts. In the parallel place 584 D there is no reason for thinking that *Ἀνδρονίκου τοῦ τραγωδοῦ* is quoted from Lynceus: Athenaeus seems to be summarising throughout. In any case the passage proves nothing as to Attic usage, Chares not being Athenian.

The last is the point on which I wish to lay most stress. Many readers may think that this passage from Athenaeus along with the Amphictyonic decree, and perhaps with some of the other inscriptions, either amounts to proof or at least raises a stronger presumption than anything I have said can rebut. Nor am I prepared very strongly to deny this, though I call attention again to the remarkable combination of *διδάσκαλοι* with *τραγωδοί* at Delphi and to the necessity of explaining the words *τραγωδός* and *κωμικός* where, as in Boeotian inscriptions, they are clearly distinguished from *ὑποκριτής*. But all the passages which it may seem natural to understand of actors are at any rate non-Attic. This may point to the actor's functions being different, song more than speech. It may however point only to a difference in the use of words. Though we talk a good deal about Attic purity, it is probable that in practice we often fail to realise the many minute differences between the Greek of Attica and the various forms of Greek current in other states of Greece. In studying the promiscuous vocabulary of Xenophon, often curiously unattic, I have had occasion to illustrate this point very frequently. There would therefore be nothing surprising in the fact, if it were established, that outside Attica *τραγωδός* and *κωμικός* sometimes bore a meaning never given to them by a careful speaker or writer of Attic. There would indeed be nothing surprising if under such circumstances a Xenophon or an Aristotle or some other writer who (unlike Aristotle) was an Athenian, and (unlike Xenophon) lived mainly at Athens was now and then betrayed into the less Attic use of the terms in question.

With regard therefore to the use of *τραγωδός* and *κωμικός* for *actor*, although I do not believe it to be Attic of the fifth and fourth centuries, I hesitate to affirm more. Others perhaps will be able to throw further light on the question. The new inscriptions of Delphi and the other finds which we are now constantly making



may help us. If it be proved, as it may, that I am quite wrong, this argument will still not have been wasted, should it lead to a thorough mustering and examining of the evidence. Many scholars have had something to say about the use of the words in the above-cited inscriptions, but it has always been taken for granted that the meaning *actor* was a *vera causa*, a fact known otherwise for certain. No one, I think, has tried to show that, at any rate in the best Attic, the words never bore that meaning.

9. When Attic and later writers have occasion to speak definitely of tragic and comic poets, by what names do they call them? Aristophanes refers to himself eight or ten times as (ὁ) ποιητής, three times as ὁ διδάσκαλος. He also uses the words κωμωδοποιητής (*Rac* 734), κωμωδοδιδάσκαλος (*Eg.* 507), τραγωδοποιός (*Thesm.* 30), τραγωδοδιδάσκαλος. κωμῶδός does not so much as occur in him or in any of the comic fragments collected by Meineke. Yet he would have been very likely to use it, if admissible, of himself or some other poet. In other writers besides ποιητής, τραγῳδίας or κωμῳδίας ποιητής, which seems the regular and perhaps technical expression in the formal language of inscriptions, and ὁ ποιήσας τραγῳδίαν or κωμῳδίαν, I have found without much seeking:—

τραγικός Sannyrion, Alexis, Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Lucian, Athenaeus, (τραγικός ποιητής Aeschines: ἀνὴρ τραγικός Plat. *Phaedo* 115 A ?).

κωμικός Polybius, Plutarch often, Lucian, M. Aurelius, Athenaeus, Pollux, (κωμικός ποιητής Aeschines, Lucian).

τραγωδ(ι)οποιός Plato, Heraclides Ponticus (who wrote a book περὶ τῶν τριῶν τραγωδοποιῶν), Aristoxenus (who wrote περὶ τραγωδοποιῶν).

κωμωδοποιός Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, Athenaeus.

κωμωδοποιητής Pollux.

τραγωδοδιδάσκαλος Aristotle, Isocrates, Dionysius H., Lucian, Athenaeus.

κωμωδοδιδάσκαλος Lysias, Aristotle, Dionysius H., Pollux.

τραγωδ(ι)ογράφος Polybius, Diodorus.

κωμωδογράφος Dioscorides: κωμῶδ(ι)ογράφος Polybius, Diodorus.

In the *Poetics* the word ποιητής occurs from thirty-five to forty times. In many of these places the sense is general, but in many of them, though certainly a minority, a tragic poet is meant. Yet Aristotle never designates a poet as τραγῶδός, unless it be in 22, 1458 b, 34 τοὺς τραγῳδοὺς ἐκω-

μῶδει, which I have explained above quite differently. On Athenaeus' incessant use of κωμωδοποιός and κωμικός see below.

If an actor is spoken of, he is ὑποκριτής, τραγικός or κωμικός ὑποκριτής (*Dem.* 5. 6: 19. 193: 57. 18: [59. 26]: *Aesch.* 1. 119 and 158), ὑποκριτής τῆς τραγῳδίας (*Ar. Pol.* 4. 17. 1336 b. 28: *Alciphron* 3. 48. 1). Οἱ κωμικοὶ in a line of Alexis (*Meineke* 3. 423 13: *Kock* 2. 329. 13) must cover actors, even if it cover the chorus too, but I have not found κωμικός or τραγικός used distinctly elsewhere of an actor, though perhaps they are. (If *Alciphron* 3. 71. 1 wrote τῷ χορῷ τῶν κωμικῶν συλλαμβάνει (με), τῶν κωμικῶν seems to mean the choreutae; but perhaps we should read τῷ κωμικῷ). Actors are also τεχνῖται, περὶ Διόνυσον τεχνῖται, etc. but like artifices this is a more general word and covers all persons, sometimes even poets, concerned with dramatic performances.

10. Whatever may be the true state of the case with regard to inscriptions, in literature proper for a long time after the Attic era it is difficult to find clear or even apparent instances of τραγῶδός or κωμῶδός in the sense of actor. Passages, far apart in time, of Chares and Diodorus have been cited above. I cannot adduce any others for the centuries covered by these names, but that may be due rather to scanty knowledge on my part and to the great imperfection of our lexicographical aids than to the fact that they do not exist. Our Greek literature of these times is also itself so scanty that no dearth of examples can warrant us in alleging the words not to have been freely used in this particular sense. The Latin use, which I will come to presently, would be likely to react on the Greek, even if it was not itself derived from a Greek, though not a good Attic, usage. This doubt may be cleared up by those more familiar than myself with literature and inscriptions of these centuries, or the discovery of fresh texts may remove it at any moment.

We do not know very well how to date the treatise περὶ ὕψους, though the trend of opinion now is towards ascribing it to the first century. A use of τραγωδοί in it is not clear. In 15. 2 the author says, referring to the *Orestes*, ἐνταῦθ' ὁ ποιητής αὐτὸς εἶδεν Ἐρινύας, and then in § 8 οἱ ῥήτορες καθάπερ οἱ τραγωδοὶ βλέπονται Ἐρινύας. At first sight we take τραγωδοί as like the ποιητής of § 2, but he goes on καὶ οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνο μαθεῖν οἱ γανταῖοι δύνανται ὅτι ὁ λέγων Ὀρέστῃς 'μέγας κ.τ.λ.' φαντάζεται ταῦθ' ὅτι μαίνεται which



looks rather as though τραγωδοί were illustrated by Orestes and therefore meant men in plays, actors. The latter sense seems for other reasons much more likely than the former, but on the whole I believe this to be a rather confused instance (like that, perhaps, above in *Oecon.* 1. 4) of οἱ τραγωδοί for tragedy.

In Plutarch it is pretty clear that such passages as the following exhibit the sense we are seeking: *Cicero* 5 'Ρωσκή τῷ κωμωδῷ ... Αἰσώπῳ τῷ τραγῳδῷ: *Phocion* 19 καί ποτε θεωμένων καινοῦς τραγῳδοῦς Ἀθηναίων ὁ μὲν τραγῳδὸς εἰσινάει μέλλον βασιλίδος πρόσωπον κ.τ.λ.: *Moralia* 334 D-F γεγόνاسι δὲ περὶ αὐτὸν (Alexander) τραγῳδοὶ μὲν οἱ περὶ Θετταλὸν καὶ ὁ Ἀθηνόδωρος...κωμῳδοὶ δ' ἦσαν οἱ περὶ Λύκωνα τὸν Σκαρφέα: τοῦτ' εἰς τινα κωμῳδίαν ἐμβαδόντι στιχὸν κ.τ.λ. cf. Chares above quoted: the same names): *ib.* 785 B Πῶλον δὲ τὸν τραγῳδὸν κ.τ.λ. But at times, e.g. *Moralia* 63 A οἱ τραγῳδοὶ χοροῦ δέονται φίλων συναδόντων, the use is not clear and τραγῳδοί might be tragedy.

A few later passages may be added both for their own sake and as illustrating the sort of evidence which is so lacking for the alleged Attic use in early centuries. (1) *Arrian Epict. Diss.* 1. 24. 18 τραγῳδῷ προσέρχῃ, οὐ τῷ ὑποκριτῇ, ἀλλ' αὐτῷ τῷ Οἰδίποδι: *ib.* 1. 29 τραγῳδός occurs several times, but possibly it refers rather to a singer, and so in 4. 7. 37; 3. 4. 1 κωμῳδῷ is pretty certainly an actor. (2) *M. Anton.* 3. 8 ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι τὸν τραγῳδὸν πρὸ τοῦ τελεῖσαι καὶ διαδραματίσαι ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι and 12. 36 ὅταν εἰ κωμῳδὸν ἀπολύει τῆς σκηνῆς ὁ παραλαβὼν στρατηγός. (3) *Lucian Navig.* 46 οἱ τοὺς βασιλεῖς ὑποκρινόμενοι τραγῳδοὶ ἐξεληθόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ θεάτρου κ.τ.λ.: *Anacharsis* 23 describes the dress, including the foot-coverings, of τραγῳδοὶ καὶ κωμῳδοὶ in a way that clearly refers, at least mainly, to actors, and so in *de Hist. Conscr.* 22 the high shoe of a τραγῳδός is mentioned. In the Ζεὺς τραγῳδός there is nothing to connect the word specially with song. Cf. the Τραγῳδοποδάγρα. Some passages again are ambiguous e.g. *Pseudol.* 10 the proverbial 'Λιεύς ὢν τραγῳδοὺς ἐμισθώσω. (4) *Phrynichus* p. 163 (Lobeck) σὺ μέντοι ἔνθα μὲν κωμῳδοὶ καὶ τραγῳδοὶ ἀγωνίζονται λογιέον ἐρεῖς, ἔνθα δὲ οἱ αἰλῆται καὶ οἱ χοροὶ ὀρχήστραν.

But even in these times the words are sometimes used with a distinct reference to singing, e.g. *Arrian Epict. Diss.* 3. 14. 1 ὡς οἱ κακοὶ τραγῳδοὶ μόνοι ἄσαι οὐ δυνάμειν ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῶν: *Lucian, Pisc.* 38 τραγῳδὸν τινα... κεκινήκαμεν ἄσόμενον τὰς Φρυγῶν συμφοράς. Sometimes the noun and the verb appear to

refer to the 'lyrical tragedy,' if so it may be called, which was in imperial times so much in favour at Rome and elsewhere, and on which we may refer to Friedländer's *Sittengesch.* 2. 404, and sometimes it is difficult to say how far plain acting is meant as distinguished from the acting of a singer. See for instance *Dio Chrys.* 33. 396 C τραγῳδὸν τινα ἐπιδημήσαντα ἡνὸχλουν ἐπιδείξασθαι κελεύοντες: *Lucian De Hist. Conscr.* 1 Ἀρχέλαος ὁ τραγῳδός...τραγῳδήσας τὴν Ἀνδρομέδαν, and two or three passages in *Dio Cassius* in which Nero ἐκίθαρε καὶ ἐτραγῳδῆσεν, &c. Cf. the *cantare Orestem, cantare tragoedias* of Suetonius.

How τραγῳδῶ lasted on in the sense of singing appears from the scholia on Theocritus (cited in the *Thesaurus*) 1. 19 ἄδειν δὲ τὸ κοινῶς τραγῳδεῖν: 3. 38 ἀσείμαι Δωρικῶς ἦγον ἄσομαι, τὸ κοινῶς τραγῳδήσω. Cf. Sophocles' *Lexicon* under this and the kindred words.

11. I do not know any examples of either word applied to a poet in a way which is to my mind quite convincing, until we get to Greek of a very questionable date, e.g.

*Vita Aeschylī* Αἰσχύλος Ἀθηναῖος ἦν καὶ τραγῳδὸς ἄριστος, τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ ὑπερβάλλον πάντας ποιητάς. Just above χορὸς τῶν τραγῳδῶν may be taken like ὁ δὲ τῶν κωμωδοποιῶν, but need not. *Schol. Ar. Ran.* 86 εἰσι δὲ ὡς φασὶ δύο Ξενοκλείς τραγῳδοὶ γεγονότες: *ib.* 367 τὸν μισθὸν τῶν κωμῳδῶν ἐμείωσαν with *schol. Eccl.* 102: *Schol. Dionys. Thr.* (Bekker *Anecd.* p. 748. 26) πολλοὶ γεγόνασι κωμῳδοὶ ἐλέγχοντες τοὺς κακῶς βιοῦντας.

I have found indeed two passages which point to the second century, but it is very doubtful whether we can rely on them. The extracts or jottings from the Σοφιστικὴ Παρασκευή of the Atticist Phrynichus refer to Aristophanes as ὁ κωμῳδός (Bekker's *Anecd.* 45. 33 δῆλον ποιοῦντος τοῦ κωμῳδοῦ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.). It would however be unsafe to conclude that we have Phrynichus' own words before us. Again in *Athenaeus* 35 D we find Χαίρημων ὁ τραγῳδός. This is not such strong evidence as may at first sight appear. Turning over the pages of *Athenaeus* I have seen κωμῳδοποιός at a rough estimate fifty or sixty times, κωμικός very often too, occasionally τραγικός and τραγῳδοποιός: τραγῳδός of a poet I have not noticed in any other place, nor κωμῳδός of a poet at all in spite of the frequency of the other words. *Chaeremon* is described as ὁ τραγῳδοποιός in 679 F and as ὁ τραγικός in 43 C, 562 E, 608 A. How easy it is for the three words to get confused with one another will appear, if we notice (for instance) that in *Athen.* 3 C and 43 C

there is the variant *κωμικός* for *κωμωδιοποιός* and that in Lucian *Iupp. Trag.* 32 some of the less good MSS. have *κωμικός* for *κωμικός*, the comic poet (ὡς ὁ κωμικός ἔφη), while *ib.* 41 one has *τραγικός* for *τραγωδιοποιός*. We have also to remember that in the first two books of Athenaeus we are in constant doubt whether the words before us are those of Athenaeus himself or those of the *epitomator* to whom the books owe their present form. It may therefore very well be the case that in 35 D *τραγικός* is a mistake for *τραγωδιοποιός*<sup>1</sup> or *τραγικός*, or that it is due to the *epitomator*, unless similar uses of the word can be adduced from Athenaeus himself or contemporary Greek: and I would rather ask whether they can than pretend to affirm that they cannot.

12. It is worth while to add a few words on the use of *comœdus* and *tragoedus* in Latin and on a Greek use which was perhaps due to Latin. No one, as far as I know, maintains that the Latin words were ever used of *poets*, and this is an important confirmation of the view that the Greek words too were not used in that sense. On the other hand they were regularly applied to *actors*, though this is far from proving that the use was admissible in good Attic. See for instance Cic. *pro Rosc. Comœdo* 10. 30, *ex pessimo histrione bonum comœdum fieri posse*: Quint. 11. 3. 91 *cum mihi comœdi quoque pessime facere videantur, qui etiamsi iuvenem agant*, &c.: cf. *ib.* 181: 1. 11. 1 and 3: Juv. 3. 100 *natio comœda est*. No one will doubt that *tragoedi* are actors in Plaut. *Poen.* 3. 2. 4 *conductor sum quam tragoedi aut comici*, or in Cic. *de Or.* 1. 28, 128 *vox tragoedorum* with Quint. 12. 5. 5 *vox quidem non ut Cicero desiderat tragoedorum sed super omnes quos ego quidem audierim tragoedos*. So, too, we may take Hor. *Ep.* 2. 2. 129 *qui se credebant miros audire tragoedos*, though perhaps Horace was thinking of the idiomatic use of *τραγῳδοί* for the *performance*. In Plaut. *Pers.* 4. 2. 4 *tragicæ et comici are actors*, like *comici* in *Poen.* 3. 2. 4 above, but as a rule they are *poets*. *Scaenicus* is another word for a performer, not an actor only: but see Vitruv. 5. 7. 2.

I do not remember to have seen it pointed out that in the above passages and others *comœdus* seems to have the generic sense of

*actor* rather than the specific one of *comic actor*. Quint. 11. 3. 91 certainly illustrates from Menander, but anyone can see that there is no stress on the comic side in any of the places cited. In Juv. 6. 73 *comœdi* is an actor in general, with some reference to singing, and *ib.* 3. 100 *natio comœda est* means that they are all born actors, not comic actors. The point is that they can play a part, not that they can raise a laugh. But of course *comœdus* and *tragoedus* can also be distinguished. Thus Cic. *Orator.* xxxi. 109 *et comœdum in tragoediis et tragoedum in comœdiis admodum placere vidimus*.

Though I have not noticed *comœdia* in the generic sense of *play*, *κωμῳδία* seems to be so used in Plutarch *Moralia* 665 E καθάπερ ἐν κωμῳδίᾳ μηχανὰς αἰρόντες καὶ βροντὰς ἐμβάλλοντες, where the reference must be to tragedy. In the *Περὶ ὕψους* 9. 15, where part of the *Odyssey* is called a *κωμῳδία ἡθολογουμένη*, we might perhaps take *κωμῳδία* in the same way, but it is less necessary. The words of M. Aurelius (12. 36) above quoted, οἷον εἰ κωμῳδὸν ἀπολύνει τῆς σκηνῆς ὁ παραλαβὼν στρατηγὸς seem to mean an actor of any kind, and so probably Arrian *Epict. Diss.* 3. 4. 1 σπουδᾶσαντος κωμῳδῶ τινι. The text is uncertain in Lucian's *Iupp. Trag.* 1, but, whether we read *κωμῳδεῖν* or *κωμῳδίαν*, it refers to the use of poetical diction and metre and therefore clearly means acting, not comic acting. When we read in Athenaeus 620 D ἑποκρίνασθαι Ἡγησίαν τὸν κωμῳδὸν τὰ Ἡσίοδου, Ἐρμόφαντον δὲ τὰ Ὀμήρου, we can hardly think that Hesiod's lines were delivered by a comic actor.

It appears likely that this use established itself in Latin first. Bentley suggested 'as a guess' that *κωμῳδία* was originally used of both comedy and tragedy. There is no evidence of this, but in late times it may have been the case with both *κωμῳδός* and *κωμῳδία*. Every one knows that it is often so in modern languages. Littré in his French Dictionary defines *comédie* as representing 'incidents ridicules, plaisants, ou intéressants' and draws no sort of distinction like ours between *comedy*, *comedian* on the one hand and *play*, *actor* on the other.<sup>2</sup> Though we never now use the

<sup>1</sup> It is curious that in quoting the Greek *Life* of Aeschines A. Müller (*Griech. Bühnenalt.* p. 197, n. 4) has inadvertently substituted *τραγῳδῶν* for *τραγωδιοποιῶν*, and that Haigh (*Attic Theatre*,<sup>2</sup> p. 242, n. 2) has written *τραγῳδοί* for *τραγωδιοποιοί* in quoting Plat. *Crat.* 425 D.

<sup>2</sup> A passage in Heine's seventh letter to Lewald illustrates at once the usage of two modern languages and the words of Juvenal above quoted: alle Franzosen geborene Komödianten sind. . . Die Franzosen sind die Hofschauspieler des lieben Gottes, les comédiens ordinaires du bon Dieu, eine auserlesene Truppe, und die ganze französische Geschichte kommt mir manchmal vor wie eine grosse Komödie, die aber zum Besten der Menschheit aufgeführt wird.

English words in that way, there are perhaps traces of such a use in Shakspeare: *Twelfth Night* 1. 5. 194 'Are you a comedian?' *Hamlet* 3. 2. 304 'if the king like not the comedy,' unless Hamlet is quoting.

On the other hand foreign languages are less ready than English to apply the words *tragedian*, *comedian* to an *author*. Even in English limitations may be noticed.

13. It may be well in conclusion to summarise the main contents of this paper. I have suggested (1) that there is no evidence for the sense of either *actor* or *poet* in good Attic of

the 5th and 4th centuries: (2) that outside Attica towards the end of that time and onwards there is evidence for *actor*, but not of a quite clear and conclusive kind, and that conclusive evidence does not appear till the first century after Christ, though we need not doubt that the sense existed earlier: (3) that the sense of *poet* is not found till at any rate the second century of our era, and perhaps not so soon. But these points have been made (let me repeat) in a tentative and interrogative rather than a positive and confident spirit. Additions or corrections will be very welcome.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

#### ON CICERO, CATO MAIOR, §§ 28, 34, 15, 38.

I NOTE with great interest the query propounded by Mr. P. O. Barendt in the current<sup>1</sup> number of the *Classical Review* (p. 402) concerning Cicero, Cato Maior, § 28. It chanced that in 1898 I read before the American Philological Association<sup>2</sup> a paper on this whole section, discussing in detail the relation of its various parts; it chanced also that I have just read the passage with a class, and so have been obliged to subject it to a fresh examination. I see no reason either to modify essentially the views of the paper referred to or to admit the need of any emendation at *splendescit*. I am glad to find Mr. Barendt in accord with one of the points maintained in my paper, namely, that *sed tamen...oratio* balances *orator...senectute*, not, as so many have thought, the *omnino*-clause. But Mr. Barendt and the scholars whom he cites as favouring an emendation at *splendescit* have, it seems to me, failed to grasp two things: (1) the significance of *languescat*, and (2) the bearing of the *omnino*-clause, or, to put this point plainly, the exact relation of the parts of the section to one another. Let us consider these points in reverse order.

1. In the *omnino*-clause Cato is doing what he does all through his discussion of the second ground of complaint against old age, i.e., he is seeking to mitigate the effect of his virtual admission of the substantial truth of the charge. At *orator...senectute* he does, indeed, for the moment confess judgment, but true to the spirit that per-

vades the discussion from § 27 on, he seeks at once in the *omnino*-clause to qualify this admission. This clause is to be taken as closely as possible with *orator...senectute*, being in effect a corrective *quamquam*-clause. I may be allowed to quote from my former paper: 'Editors have erred because Cicero has not expressed himself with the care requisite to bring out the logical relation of the various elements of his thought. Had he said simply, *Orator...senectute, quamquam canorum...annos*, beginning a new sentence at *Sed tamen*, all would have been well. The introduction of *est enim...virium*, however, led to a complete change in the structure of the sentence, since a *quamquam*-clause after that, referring back to *orator...senectute*, would have been most awkward. Cicero might, indeed, have had recourse to another expedient, namely, that of expressing the thought of *est enim...virium* by a causal *cum*-clause preceding *orator...senectute*. He might have said, for example, "*Oratoris cum munus non ingeni solum sit sed laterum etiam et virium, metuo ne languescat senectute, quamquam canorum illud, etc.*"'

2. *Languescat* is to be interpreted as literally as possible; cf. § 26 *sed videtis ut senectus non modo languida atque iners non sit*. To this view both *senis sermo quietus et remissus* and *compta et mitis oratio*, § 28, point, when rightly interpreted. Professor Bennett takes *quietus* of the lack of gesticulation, i.e., of the absence of physical energy. The figure in *remissus* is too common for comment; that Cicero felt it may be inferred from § 37: *intantum enim animum*

<sup>1</sup> November 1899. By an accident this paper did not reach the Editor till April 1, 1900.—ED. C.R.

<sup>2</sup> See Proceedings of the Association, xxix. p. 5.

tamquam arcum habebat. *Mitis* has not received all the attention it deserves; it seems to me to connote, precisely as do *quietus* and *remissus*, the absence of active physical strength. We have a partial parallel in § 71: quasi poma ex arboribus, cruda si sunt, vi evelluntur, si matura et cocta, decidunt, sic vitam adolescentibus vis aufert, senibus maturitas. Cf. too Virgil's *cruda et viridis senectus*. Sourness belongs to the fruit in its period of growth and vigorous strength; *mitis*, with its suggestion of softness (cf. *cocta*, § 71, *vietum et caducum*, § 5) naturally connotes the absence of vigour.

I pass now to make my main point, which is that Cicero is thinking of the severe tax made by the canons of Roman oratory on the orator's physical strength. We get other hints of this in the Cato Maior, e.g., in § 14: cum ego...legem Voconiam magna voce et bonis lateribus suavissem. This point I need not, I am sure, argue at length; I shall jot down one or two things that occur to me in illustration. Cf., for example, what Cicero says in the Brutus, §§ 313-316, concerning his own early oratorical style, and its effect upon his health. There is no hint at all that he sought to change his style because it ran counter to convention. The importance of gesticulation in Roman oratory appears clearly from Quintilian's discussion of the subject (xi. 3. 65-136). The fatigue of pleading is touched upon in § 136. We may compare the story told by Gellius (i. 5) of the criticisms to which Hortensius was subjected on account of the pains he bestowed upon his dress and his gestures. It was the variety and vigour of the gestures (as well, perhaps, as the length to which speeches were often carried: see Pliny, *Epp.*, i. 20) which made such demands on the orator's strength.

In this connection some remarks made by Professor Greenough<sup>1</sup> in an article concerning the production of the *Phormio* at Harvard University in April, 1894, are suggestive. Speaking of the photographs of scenes in the play which illustrate his article, Mr. Greenough says: 'The reader will notice in the pictures some attitudes and a number of gestures which differ from our ordinary ones. These were drawn chiefly from Quintilian and the miniatures of the Vatican manuscript,<sup>2</sup> and apparently belonged to the conventions of the ancient stage. Again, the movements on the stage

were much more varied and violent than we should expect now in a play of the same general class. This also was conventional. There is no doubt that the action of even a more quiet play... like the *Phormio* was much more pronounced in gesticulation, pantomime and movement than we usually see, except in a horseplay farce. The Mediterranean nations are remarkable for a freedom of gesture almost amounting to pantomime, which is unknown to northern peoples, and this tendency seems to have come down to them from very early times.' What is here said of Roman acting may, I take it, be fairly enough applied to Roman oratory.

Enough has been said, I hope, to make the passage both 'coherent' and 'satisfactory,' to use Mr. Barendt's words. Cicero is talking of two qualities of the ideal orator, physical strength and perfection of voice. Obviously, the two need not subsist side by side. This is precisely what Cicero is trying to say. He starts by saying that he fears the former of these two qualities will be lost through old age, pauses a moment to note that the other is present in enlarged measure even in old age, and concludes by asserting that the absence of the former works no serious harm, since the second, unsupported by the first (*ipsa*), is sufficiently effective.

A word in conclusion on *splendescit*. Professor Bennett has commented on the mixture of metaphors in *canorum* and *splendescit*. I fail to see the mixture. The metaphor in *splendere* and similar verbs was probably moribund. In § 35 Cato says of the son of Africanus Maior: Quod ni ita fuisset, alterum illud exstisset lumen civitatis. He does not apologize for *lumen* by *quasi* or the like, nor does he take the trouble to accommodate his verb to *lumen*, as he would have done had the metaphor been still vigorous. On *canorum* used of the orator we may compare Mr. Haigh's<sup>3</sup> remark that ancient writers, in speaking of the training of the actor's voice, use language which to us would seem more appropriate to a notice of an operatic singer.

§ 34. *Ne sint in senectute vires. Ne postulantur quidem vires a senectute*, etc. I have noted an excellent commentary on this passage in Pliny, *Epp.*, iv. 23, especially § 3: Nam et prima vitae tempora et media patriae, extrema nobis imperire debemus, ut ipsae leges monent, quae maiorem annis otio reddunt.

<sup>1</sup> *New England Magazine*, 1894, pp. 501, 502.

<sup>2</sup> The italics are mine.

<sup>3</sup> *Attic Theatre*, p. 246.



§ 15. Editorial comments on *etenim* generally leave something to be desired. They imply rather than say that logically *etenim* introduces *earum...videamus*, and that the latter clause is to be interpreted as 'meaning, in the last analysis, 'no one of these four reasons is sound.' This is good so far as it goes. What I miss is a presentation of the exact relation of the whole passage to what precedes.

With the words *ut paene eis delectari videretur*, Cato has struck an entirely new note in his comments on men's attitude toward old age. Hitherto the most he has ventured to say is that under certain conditions men find old age *tolerabilis*. Cf. the end of § 7 and the beginning of § 8. By implication, too, the same thought is brought out in § 4: *qui autem omnia bona a se ipsi petunt, eis nihil potest malum videri quod naturae necessitas afferat*. All this pictures a purely passive and negative attitude, whereas in *ut...videretur*, § 14, there is a decided advance to a positive attitude. One who could find old age a source of positive delight might well have seemed a strange creature; I take it that the average Roman viewed old age much as did Caecilius (§ 25) or Juvenal. Hence, Cato qualifies his assertion concerning Ennius by *paene*, and by passing on at once to show that the grounds of complaint against old age are of no weight. In this

way the passage from the preliminary conversation to the discussion proper is effected most naturally and smoothly.

For the rôle played by *etenim*, § 15, we may find a complete parallel in the Cato Maior itself, § 39, *Accipite enim*, &c. Logically, of course, *enim* introduces *Nullam capitaliorem*, &c. The whole means, plainly, 'For, as Archytas said to, . . . no more baneful, &c.'

§ 38. *Nunc cum maxime conficio orationes*. Prof. Reid explains *cum maxime* as elliptical, and takes the whole phrase as put for *cum maxime conficio orationes, nunc conficio*. So others. I have always doubted; the supposed fuller form seems too cumbersome for belief. Why not suppose that the original form was simply *nunc est cum maxime conficio orationes*? For this form cf. Plautus, *Captivi*, 516: *Nunc illud est quom me fuisse quam esse nimio mavelim*, and the editors ad loc., especially Brix; *nimio* is a good parallel to the *maxime* of the idiom. My explanation seems to afford not only a perfectly simple phrase as the starting-point of the idiom, but a starting-point from which the idiom could easily have been developed. For examples of *nunc cum maxime*, see Spengel on *Andria*, 823.

CHARLES KNAPP.

BARNARD COLLEGE,  
Nov. 29, 1899.

#### ON CICERO, CATO MAJOR, § 28.

AN orator may be failing (*languescere*) in spite of the fact that his tones are still ringing. The power of sustained effort may be passing away, his memory may be more treacherous than before, and general effectiveness may be lessening in many ways. Appius Claudius Caecus rose to one supreme occasion supremely, but of course we cannot suppose that he could have done so often. As to the sentence 'Sed tamen,' &c., the

statement there seems to be simply that a less ambitious style of declamation is becoming to the orator who has grown old—i.e., is more in keeping with the dignity of years and a less impetuous character, notwithstanding the possible possession of ringing tones.

JOSEPH F. PAXTON.

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA, U.S.A.  
January 19th, 1900.



## ON JUVENAL, SAT. I 102 ff.

- 102 'prior,' inquit, 'ego adsum.  
 cur timeam dubitemve locum defendere,  
 quamvis  
 natus ad Euphraten, molles quod in  
 aure fenestrae  
 105 arguerint, licet ipse negem? sed quin-  
 que tabernae  
 quadringenta parant. quid confert  
 purpura maior  
 optandum, si Laurenti custodit in agro  
 conductas Corvinus oves, ego possideo  
 plus  
 Pallante et Licinis?'

The speaker is a freedman, who has come to receive his sportula and insists that he be attended to before the praetor and the tribune, as he has come first.

In l. 106 P reads *purpuraemator*, changed by a later hand into *purpura maior*, the reading of some of the inferior MSS.; others have: *purpurae amator*, the majority *purpura maius*.

To my knowledge the reading *purpura maior* has been accepted by all editors. It was supposed to denote the laticlave, which formed the distinction between senators and knights, and, being worn by the praetor and tribune, mentioned in l. 101, against whom the freedman is vindicating his rights, it was accordingly thought to be contrasted with 'quadringenta [sestertia]'; for this, constituting as it did, the census of the knights was thus explained as standing for 'purpura minor,' the dignity of the tunica angusticlavia, worn by the freedman.

But (1) the freedman manifestly is referring to his *income*, or perhaps to part of it, as amounting to four hundred thousand sesterces, and since a *capital* or *estate* valued at 400,000 sesterces entitled the possessor to the rank of eques, an income of that amount could never be used as characteristic of knighthood. Evidently Juvenal used 'quadringenta' here merely to denote a large sum of money, exactly as in Sat. II. 117 and V. 132.

(2) '*purpura maior*' is an exceedingly strange phrase to designate the broad purple stripe; one would at least have expected '*purpura latio*' and, in fact, we nowhere else find the expression in the sense generally assigned to it.

(3) But even when so understood we are involved in inextricable difficulties, for the Corvinus, cited to exemplify the little benefit

to be derived from the *purpura maior*, manifestly has left the ranks of the senators long ago, and, therefore, *purpura maior* would have to be interpreted to mean: 'the circumstance that you once have worn the tunica laticlavia.'

(4) Finally the two scholia on this passage comment on *purpura* alone, one explaining it as '*laticlavium*.'

But apart from these objections, what is the purport and tenor of the entire passage? Juvenal depicts the insolent and arrogant behaviour of one of these low-born Orientals against the *ipsei Troiugenae* (l. 100), the praetor and tribune (l. 101) figuring as their representatives; the freedman sneers at these noble Romans, because he, although born at the Euphrates, leads a luxurious life and possesses great wealth, while a Corvinus, although a descendant of a most illustrious house, lives in extreme poverty. The freedman does not contrast his supposed knighthood with the senatorial rank of the tribune and the praetor, for he lays no claim to any rank, nay, he even boasts, on the strength of his wealth, of his low and foreign birth. And, therefore, we expect him not to ask 'what good does it do to wear the laticlave?' but 'what is the good of being a native Roman,' or 'of being a descendant of a noble Roman house?' Now this very sense is supplied by one of the inferior MSS., reading: *purpura maiorum*.

The corruption in the other MSS. (including P) is easily explained. The archetype read something which was mistaken for *MATOR* and this was emended variously into *emator*, *amator*, *maior* and *maius*, the corruption simply arising from the fact that the stroke representing the ending -um had been placed by a scribe of the archetype too near the I (r); *maiorum* therefore is at least as probable a correction of P's reading as *maior*.

*Purpura* alone in the meaning of purple garment, such as were worn by high officials at festivals and other solemn occasions, and hence, metaphorically, as denoting a position of high rank, as consulship and in later times even the emperor, is of frequent occurrence. Cp. Ov. *Fast.* i. 81, iamque novi praeunt fasces, nova purpura fulget; Seneca *Ep.* 69, 4 ambitio purpuram [promittit] et plausum et ex hoc potentiam; *fragm.* 124 hic est ille homo honestus non apice, purpure, e.q.s.; Sil. Ital. 14, 112 tertia pur-

pura (consulship); Mart. viii. 8, 4 purpura te felix, te colat omnis honos; viii. 66, 8 gaudenti superest adhuc, quod optet, felix purpura tertiusque consul; x. 10, 12 purpura vestra.

*Purpura maiorum* then would mean: 'the high dignity of one's forefathers,' 'the lofty station held by one's ancestors,' and could the freedman cite a better instance, exemplifying the little value of noble descent, than this Corvinus, a member of the illustrious gens Valeria, now compelled to work for wages?

One point more remains. In accepting the advocated reading we would have in l. 106 a hypermeter, Juvenal having nowhere else made use of this freedom. But, as is well-known, it is also found but once in Lucretius (cp. L. Müller *De R. M.* p. 354);

moreover it is here particularly justified, because *optandum* belongs in sense and construction to the preceding line; finally it is highly probable that the very existence of the hypermeter has been largely responsible for the corruption in our MSS.

The meaning of the entire passage is, therefore, this: 'I was here first; why should I hesitate to defend my rights, although only a freedman, and reared on the Euphrates? I am rich: and of what benefit is it to a man, to be able to boast of a long line of illustrious ancestors? Since a Corvinus hardly manages to keep alive, while I possess greater wealth than a Pallas and a Licinus.'

N. P. VLACHOS.

Philadelphia, Feb. 1900.

#### ON JUVENAL SAT. III., 203.

##### *Urceoli sex.*

These words are always taken as describing the extreme poverty of Codrus; namely, that his marble slab had as decorations only six mugs with a *cantharus* beneath, thus suggesting by way of contrast the *abaci* in the house of the rich man, covered with different kinds of *pocula* and other drinking utensils made of silver, gold, crystal and murrhine. However there is nothing in the verses following which indicates that Juvenal had this in his mind, although the contrast is carried out in reference to *recubans*—Chiron and *Graecoslibellos*. Cf. v. 216 Hic—v. 219 Minervam.

A characteristic of the style of Juvenal is his indirect mode of expression, frequently with underlying humor. This Satire abounds in examples of this peculiarity; vv. 26–28, 66, 91 &c., consequently we should expect that the words *urceoli sex* have an implied meaning.

Juvenal in his description of the rich man says among other things that he is *orbis lautissimus* v. 221. This relates not only to his loss by fire, but also to the fact that he was childless and therefore received valuable presents. Cf. v. 129. If we adopt the best MSS. reading *Haec* in verse 218, we can conclude that the rich

man was unmarried. This is but another instance of Juvenal's indirect style. In this way is brought out the contrasted condition of the poor man, who has not only a wife but also *urceoli sex*. This can mean nothing else than that his family consisted of six persons, not a small number at a time when it could be said *in civitate nostra plus gratiae orbitas confert quam eripit*. This explanation shows the miserable plight of Codrus and makes the picture more graphic. Here is a poor man living in an attic with scarcely any furniture and few utensils and having a wife and large family depending upon him. He loses all and no one will give him even *frusta*.

The *urceoli* were commonly intended for individual use and contained hot or cold water, to be mixed with the wine. In this family, however, the *urceoli* had to serve also as *pocula*. These with the *cantharus* placed beneath the slab, which was not large enough to hold it, included all the drinking utensils of Codrus.

Jul. Paullus 111. 6, 90 gives a hint that *urceoli* were used at times as *pocula*. He says: *Omnia quae ad poculorum speciem veluti paterae, culices, scyphi, urceoli, &c.*

W. O. SPROULL.

University of Cincinnati.

SHOULD THE MAY-POTENTIAL USE OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE BE  
RECOGNIZED IN LATIN?

In his Critique of Some Recent Subjunctive Theories (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. IX.), Bennett cites passages and uses arguments, intended to disprove the claim, advanced in my Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses, that the Latin subjunctive has not the power of expressing the 'may-possibly' idea. For the purposes of the discussion in my Studies, I accepted Roby's list of instances from Silver Latin as sufficiently complete for that period. Bennett cites the following as additional instances, not considered by me:

Plaut. Asin. 465 *sit, non sit, non edepol scio*.

Fronto, p. 25, 10; 136, 1; 224, 19 (Naber) *quaeras fortasse*; p. 63, 1 *fortasse requiras*; p. 159 *dicas fortasse*; p. 114, 9 *fortasse contemnas*.

Ps.-Quint. Decl. CCLI (p. 27, 28, Ritter) *habeant fortasse*.

Pliny, Epp. 1, 23, 2 *erraverim fortasse*.

I cannot see that these passages form any obstacle in the way of my contention. Let us consider them for a moment in some detail. Bennett thinks it impossible to interpret the Plautus passage, *sit, non sit, non edepol scio*, otherwise than as meaning, *it may be he, it may not be he; I don't pretend to know*. The subjunctive in such passages is commonly<sup>1</sup> explained as being a subjunctive of indirect question with *utrum...an* omitted as in Cic. Quint. Frat. 3, 8, 4 *uelit nolit scire difficile est*; and elsewhere. See, for instance, Kühner, § 234, Anm. 2 (p. 1017), and compare § 177 (p. 754), III, and Gray's note on Ter. Heaut. 643. As Bennett does not state his objections to the usual interpretation of such passages, and as that interpretation seems to me entirely satisfactory in every respect, I cannot see that the passage has any weight against me. This passage, by the way, would, *without the presence of non scio*, be just the sort of passage that Bennett needs to prove his case. I must still insist upon the principle which I laid down in my Studies as being so self-evident as to be axiomatic viz. 'that, no separate class of uses should be made, or recognized, for a mood, unless there is at least one passage, somewhere in the literature, that cannot be satisfactorily explained in any other way. As applied to the case in

hand, the principle may be stated as follows: If there is not at least one instance of the subjunctive mood that can be explained in no other way than by supposing it to have the force of "may possibly," or at least an instance that can be better explained by supposing it to have such a force than by explaining it according to some one of the recognized and indisputable uses of that mood, then there is no justification, or excuse, for supposing it to have that force.' Now, if it were not for the presence of *non scio*, in the Plautus passage that has prompted these remarks, I do not see how *sit, non sit* could possibly be interpreted as meaning anything else than *it may be he, it may not be he*. And if Bennett can find anywhere in Latin literature a single instance such as this would be without the presence of *non scio*, I will admit at once that my whole case has collapsed. Why is it that in such cases we always find some other form of expression e.g. *potest* with the infinitive, or *fortasse* with the indicative?

The passages from Fronto and the one from Ps. Quint., with one possible exception,<sup>2</sup> seem to me to yield perfectly good sense if interpreted as instances of the contingent use of the subjunctive; thus, *dicas fortasse*, may well mean *perhaps you would say, quaeras fortasse, perhaps you would ask* (where we should commonly say *perhaps you would like to know*). The modal force of the subjunctive would then be exactly the same as in the common English expression 'you would suppose.'<sup>3</sup> This brings up the whole question of the naturalness of the conception involved in this interpretation. Bennett denies even the possibility of the conception or of the interpretation. In translating the *dicat fortasse aliquis* in Pliny N.H. 36, 2, I used the expression 'some one would perhaps rejoin.' Of this translation Bennett says (p. 37) 'I must submit that this use of "would" is unknown to our English speech.'

<sup>2</sup> In the passage on p. 63, line 1, the subjunctive in *fortasse requiras* may perhaps be best explained in the same way as in the *erraverim fortasse*, to be discussed later on in this paper, i.e. as due to the influence of *forsitan* reflected through *fortasse*. This same explanation would apply equally well to the other instances.

<sup>3</sup> In 'perhaps you would ask,' the 'would' might sometimes be felt as involving a wish (= *would like*), but such expressions are commonly used to express mere contingency, as in 'you would suppose,' 'one would take you for a fool,' &c.

<sup>1</sup> Bennett, so far as I know, stands alone in his interpretation of such passages.

Whether this criticism is well founded or not must be settled by each individual for himself. I have myself been guilty all my life of using 'would' in just such cases and I have frequently heard it used in the same sense by others. Moreover, I am assured by several specialists in English, of the highest reputation, to whom I have submitted the entire passage in which I used the expression in question, that my expression 'some one would perhaps rejoin' represents a perfectly legitimate and natural use of 'would.' Others might agree with Bennett. To all who are not familiar with this use of 'would' I can readily understand that my interpretation of the passages in question may seem forced or unnatural. But I cannot understand how even they can regard it as impossible, when to so many other people it seems natural and is a matter of common usage. However, the question as to whether my use of 'would' was a legitimate one or not is not of the slightest importance in settling the main point at issue, *viz.* whether the Latin subjunctive is used in such contingent expressions, and, if so, whether that interpretation is possible in the passages under discussion. Whether the Latin subjunctive is so used admits of no doubt. If *nemo dicat* can mean *no one would say*, there can be no possible objection on the ground of modal usage to interpreting *aliquis dicat* as meaning *some one would say*. Whether such an interpretation does justice to the passages in question must be left to the judgment of our readers. It seems to me (and, I find, to many others) that it does, and that this interpretation yields satisfactory sense in nearly all the instances of the present subjunctive that are commonly regarded as instances of the may-potential use; and that, where it does not, the alternative interpretation suggested in my Studies is possible and not unnatural. This applies even to *fors fuat an* (and *fors sit an*) which Bennett regards as capable of meaning only *it may be a chance whether*. I fail to see how this satisfies the requirements of the original sense of the phrase any better than *it would be a matter of chance whether*, or some similar expression. A phrase which had this latter meaning would easily come to be used in the sense of 'possibly,' 'perhaps.'

There remains to be considered the *erraverim fortasse* in Pliny. If I am not mistaken, this *erraverim* has been responsible for much mischief. I believe it to be the only instance of the kind in Latin literature—the only one that apparently

gives (and only apparently, I think) justification for the claim that the perfect subjunctive *fecerim* may mean 'I may (perhaps) have done.' Certainly none other occurs before the period of decline. Generalizing from this particular instance, grammarians have treated this as a normal use of the subjunctive. And to-day Latin grammars (even those which no longer translate *amem*, etc., in paradigms of the conjugations, by *I may love*, as all grammars used to do),<sup>1</sup> continue to translate *amaverim*, etc. (in the paradigms) by *I may have loved*, etc. and thus to ask beginners to learn this as illustrating the *regular force* of the perfect subjunctive! I believe that Pliny's *erraverim*, aided perhaps by certain uses of the subjunctive with *forsitan* (see below), has done the whole mischief: and I cannot but think that the force of the subjunctive even in this *erraverim fortasse* has been misunderstood. There can, I think, be no doubt that, at least prior to the period of decline, the subjunctive with *forsitan* (*i. e.* *fors sit an*) continued to be felt merely as the subjunctive of indirect question. This is shown by the facts presented in the note on pages 177-179 of my Studies. To the evidence there presented should be added the further fact that *forsitan* could, until comparatively late times, be used only *before* its verb, as would be expected if the *an* were still felt as governing the verb, while *fortasse* followed the word it modified as often as it preceded it. When *forsitan* began to cease to be felt as introducing an indirect question, it then began to take the indicative, like *fortasse*, and, like it, to follow sometimes the word it modified, and, like it, to be used also with adjectives, adverbs, infinitives, etc. *Forsitan* and *fortasse* seem to have mutually influenced each other—a common phenomenon in language illustrated again, for instance, in *quamquam* and *quamvis*. In classical Latin *quamquam* is used regularly with the indicative and *quamvis* with the subjunctive; but in the period of decline *quamquam*, through the influence of *quamvis*, sometimes takes the subjunctive with an indicative sense, and *quamvis*, through the influence of *quamquam*, sometimes takes the indicative. In a similar manner, as soon as *forsitan*, under the influence of *fortasse*, ceased to be felt

<sup>1</sup> In giving this translation, the authors of grammars probably had chiefly in mind certain subordinate clauses, *e.g.* purpose clauses; but students invariably gained the impression that the translation represented the regular force of the mood in independent clauses. Some grammars even gave *can love*, &c., side by side with *may love*.



as introducing an indirect question, it began to take the indicative; and at the same time *fortasse*, through the influence of *forsitan*, came occasionally to be construed with the subjunctive. The subjunctive in *errauerim fortasse* may be due indirectly to the influence of *forsitan* reflected through *fortasse*. I do not see how else we can account for this use of the perfect subjunctive in Pliny in a manner hitherto unknown to the Latin language. If this be the true explanation of *errauerim fortasse*, we shall have to regard the mood of *errauerim* as due merely to a mechanical association with the use of the subjunctive in indirect questions introduced by *forsitan*. The potential idea involved in the expression would then be due wholly to the *fortasse*, just as, in similar expressions formed by *forsitan* and the subjunctive in classical Latin, the potential idea involved is due wholly to *forsitan* and not at all to the mood of the verb. A potential idea is similarly involved in *fortasse erravi* which means *I may have erred* (lit. *I have perhaps erred*), but no one would on that account say that the indicative *erravi* expresses possibility. Of course it would have been easily possible for the association of ideas, and of usages, involved in this explanation of *errauerim fortasse*, to result ultimately in giving to the subjunctive mood itself a force that had hitherto been foreign to it. But that the subjunctive mood itself ever did actually gain this force, I can not believe until an example is cited similar to *erraverim*, but without the presence of *forsitan* or *fortasse*. I do not believe that such an instance can be cited. If any can be, then we shall have to set it down as representing a use of the subjunctive that was first acquired during the period of decline. In the meantime let us make haste to discard, from the paradigms of conjugations in our school books, such translations of *amaverim*, *monuerim*, etc. as 'I may have loved,' 'I may have advised,' etc.

Before taking leave of this subject, I may say a word regarding Bennett's criticism of *some one will have said* (i.e. during this discourse) as a translation of *dixerit quispiam* in Cic. de senectute 3, 8. This interpretation was suggested by Roby and adopted by me. Regarding it, Bennett uses the following language: 'I cannot help feeling that this is highly absurd. The words quoted are those of Cato. He is speaking to Laelius and Scipio. Obviously, if any one had said anything while Cato was discoursing, it must have been one of these

two young men. But *quispiam* cannot refer to either of them. Again, what point is there in the conception "will have said during this discourse"? How could any one have said anything during the discourse without interrupting the speaker? It cannot be urged that *dixerit* means "will have said to himself"; that would have been *secum dixerit*, etc.' Bennett is here straining my words somewhat. My translation was intended merely as illustrative. I should be perfectly ready to give up the phrase 'during this discourse,' as the one to be supplied, and to use in its place 'in the course of his own discussion on some other occasion,' or anything else to suit the situation. It would be still better not to attempt to fix any particular point prior to which the saying is to take place, as the expression is in any case a mere formula. If we are going to insist upon indicating the exact status of the act of saying, even in *dices*, *aliquis dicet*, etc., we shall have to admit that the speaker never really expects the act to take place at all. *Dices*, *you will say so and so*, is very common in dialogue, but no instance can be cited, I believe, where the person thus addressed ever does actually say the thing the speaker asserts he will. Neither *dixerit*, nor *dices*, nor *dicet* in such cases is ever uttered as a prophecy. These expressions are used merely as convenient means of introducing the discussion of some possible objection that occurs to the speaker himself. If the same method of argument were used in discussing *dices*, *aliquis dicet*, etc., that Bennett uses in discussing *aliquis dixerit*, one might claim with equal force that the verb in these expressions can not mean *will say*. One might, for instance, argue as follows: '*Dices* can not mean *you will say*; for when is the person addressed by *dices* going to say the thing referred to? If he says it during the discourse, it will interrupt somebody (of which he of course will not be guilty); and he will not say it after the discussion is over, as he goes out of the door, for it would be rude not to wait for an answer, and, in any case, it would then be too late to renew the discussion; and he will not say it next day, or later, because if he has any objection to offer, it will not be natural to wait so long before making it. Furthermore no instance can be cited where the person thus addressed by *dices* ever does actually say the thing indicated. Therefore *you will say*, as a translation of *dices*, is inappropriate, untrue, and so impossible.' I maintain that this

sort of argument is not to the point. I may have been unhappy in fixing upon the point of time prior to which the saying is to take place, but I do not see how that has any essential bearing upon the question at stake, *viz.* whether *dixerit* is future perfect indicative. If it be said that the future perfect does not seem natural, the reply will be that perhaps it does not to the English idiom, but it is, so far as I can see, just as natural to the Latin idiom as scores of indisputable future perfects where this tense would be impossible in English, *e.g.* *videro* (Cic. Verr. 2, 61, 150 and often; see Roby, Lat. Gram. p. CVI); *fecero* (Ter. Phorm. 882 and often); and countless other

instances of the same sort. Similarly in *riserit aliquis fortasse* and *fuertit fortasse dicendi* the future perfect seems strange in English, but equally strange uses of the future perfect are met with frequently in some authors and are absent from very few.

I can not feel that Bennett has satisfactorily answered the various objections I raised to the usual interpretation of *aliquis dixerit*. My argument in favour of taking *dixerit* as a future perfect indicative still seems to me to be conclusive and unanswerable.

H. C. ELMER.

Cornell University.

## TWO NOTES ON THE LATIN SUBJUNCTIVE.

### 1. The 'May have' perfect.

*Erraverim fortasse*, Pl. *Ep.* 1, 23, 2, has apparently been regarded by grammarians as the only instance of the use of the perfect in the sense of 'may have.' Professor Bennett, the latest defender of the 'may potential' (*Cornell Studies IX*), while citing various presents gives only this example of the perfect. A search through a number of representative writers of the Empire failed to reveal a second example, until an examination of the *Declamations of the Pseudo-Quintilian* for another purpose resulted in the discovery of the existence of ten instances of the usage. They are all of the *fortasse* type, but I am confident that a longer search in Silver Latinity, which I hope to make, will disclose the existence of others, unaccompanied by *fortasse*.

The examples are: p. 183, 3, 4 (Ritter) *fortasse erraverim in dispiciendis causis, minus prudentiae habuerim iuvenis*; 69, 13, *vos fortasse plus consumpseritis, patres*; 159, 2, *quod fortasse etiam corruperit mores meos*; 171, 14, *et fortasse accidere somnus hic potuerit inter plures*; 182, 27, *despiciendum tibi fortasse fuerit, ad quem venires*; 184, 8, *aliud fortasse fuerit, quod te postea concitarit*; 328, 27, *fortasse etiam contulerint ista detrimenta deliciis tuis*; 344, 1, *et alius fortasse tantum usurpaverit libertatem*; 379, 15, *fortasse morituum non putaveris*.

*Fortasse* with the present occurs in seven passages (the second of which is cited by Bennett: 12, 2, *fortasse possit*; 27, 28, *habeant fortasse*; 62, 11, *fiant fortasse*; 143, 18, *conveniat fortasse*; 178, 21, *fortasse*

*commendet*; 189, 12, *possis fortasse*; 327, 25, *adferat fortasse*.

I am making a collection of 'may potentials' in Silver Latin (here more types appear to exist), believing with Bennett that 'other instances quite as decisive could be gathered by systematic searching, particularly in the Latinity of the early Empire.'

### 2. The Negative with Expressions of the Restitutes Type.

Bennett, speaking of expressions of the *restitutes, repugnasses* type, says (*Cornell Studies IX*, 27): 'the negative is regularly *ne not non*.' He cites three passages from Plautus, two from Cicero, one from Seneca, and one from Fronto. The second person occurs in all save the last. The negative in every case but one is *ne*, and here Bennett gives an ingenious, if not entirely convincing explanation of the use of *non*.

The usage is certainly infrequent, for the only instance I have noted in a rather careful examination of a large portion of Silver Latin are three from the *Pseudo-Quintilian*, where the negative is *non*. They are: 12, 15, *virginem hanc aut viduam non diceres* (*dicere A*); 37, 4, *invitum non de <di> dissetis*; 53, 18, in his etiam minimis observationibus inhumane non *cederes* (*inhumanum ne ced. B*) *honorem lateris*.

It is to be hoped that the collection may be enlarged, for with only nine passages on which to base the argument (and these in the ratio of five to four) it is impossible to state the regular negative with certainty.

WILLARD K. CLEMENT,

University of Chicago.

## DIES COMMUNES = DIES ATRI.

MACROB. *Sat.* I. 16. 21. Dies autem post-  
triduanos [*i.e.* the days immediately fol-  
lowing the Kalends, Nones, and Ides, as the  
context shows] ad omnia maiores nostri  
cavendos putarunt; quos etiam *atros* velut  
infausta appellatione damnarunt. Eosdem  
tamen non nulli *communes* velut ad emenda-  
tionem nominis vocitaverunt.

This passage explains the frag. of the  
*Lucubratio* of Atta, *ap. Non.* 468, 23.  
(O. Ribbeck. *comic frag.* 3 p. 190.)

Cum primo luci hodie ut exornata sit  
Atque auspiciis: eras est communis dies.

*i.e.* 'See that she is got ready the first thing  
this morning [the *lucubratio*, which gives  
the name to the play, is presumably *lucubratio*  
antelucana rather than *vespertina*; and the occasion is possibly, as Patin (*La*  
*Poésie Latine* II. 325) suggests, the prepara-

tions for a marriage], and take the auspices:  
to-morrow is a common (unlucky) day.'  
cf. Afranius, *Fratriae* IV. in Rib.<sup>2</sup> p. 218.  
Septembris heri Kalendae, hodie ater est  
dies.

I give this note because neither Lewis and  
Short nor Facciolati-Forcellini notice the  
use of *communis*, and Ribbeck's reference,  
on the frag. of Atta, to Macrobian *Sat.* I. 16. 3.  
is misleading. There we read: *Festi* [dies]  
dis dicati sunt, *profesti* hominibus ob admin-  
istrandam rem privatam publicamque con-  
cessi, *intercisi* deorum hominumque com-  
munes sunt . . . illorum enim dierum qui-  
busdam horis fas est, quibusdam fas non est  
ius dicere; *i.e.* *dies intercisi* = half holidays,  
but the word *communes* is not used in an  
appellative sense at all, and the lines of  
Atta are not in any sense illustrated.

NOWELL SMITH.

## NOTES.

TWO EMENDATIONS OF SAPPHO.—In Sappho's reply  
to Alcaeus (Arist. *Rhet.* I. 9), the *ἔμμαρ* at the end  
of the third corrupt line is probably corrupt. There  
can be no question here of Alcaeus' shamed expression.  
I should suggest *αἶδως* *κε* *σ'* *οὐ* *κατέειχεν* *δρῶν*.

In the famous ode *φαίνεται μοι κῆνος* I  
suggest in line 16 *φαίνου' Ἀγαλλί* for *φαίνομαι* *ἀλλὰ*,  
Agallis being the name of the lady to whom Sappho  
addresses it. Agallis is recorded as a courtesan's  
name in later times, and we know that the names of  
Sappho's friends were favourite noms de guerre of  
courtesans. The elision *φαίνου'*, is, as Wilamowitz  
has shown, the rule in Aeolic verse.

W. R. PATON.

CALYMNOS,

Feb. 14th, 1900.

ON THUCYDIDES IV. 18, 4.—*σφοδρῶν δὲ ἀνδρῶν*,  
*οἵτινες . . . τὸν τε πόλεμον νομίσωσι μὴ καθ' ὅσον ἔν τις*  
*αὐτοῦ μέρος βούληται μεταχειρίζειν, τοῦτ' ἐκτελεῖν*,  
*ἀλλ' ὥς ἂν αἱ τύχαι αὐτῶν ᾗσιν ᾗσιν.* The general  
sense of this sentence is clear enough, viz. That  
when a man once engages in war, he cannot  
afterwards limit its operations according to his own  
wishes, but fortune also plays a part; and the thought  
of human effort as being interfered with by fortune  
is familiar to Thucydides, e.g. vi. 78, 2 *οὐ γὰρ οἶόν τε*  
*ἡμᾶς τῆς τε ἐπιθυμίας καὶ τῆς τύχης τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμοίως*  
*ταμίαν γενέσθαι*, and again iv. 64, 1. The exact  
manner however in which the sense is to be extracted  
from the words is much in dispute. The controversy  
centres round the word *τοῦτ'*. Admitting that *τὸν*  
*πόλεμον* is the subject to *ἐκτελεῖν* (as nearly all  
editors take it) we may question whether *τοῦτ'*  
refers to *τις* or to *μέρος*.

The objection to referring *τοῦτ'* to *τις* (as Poppo,  
Jowett and Graves do) is that a wrong emphasis is  
thus given to the sentence. The sense is not that  
'war does not abide with some particular person as  
far as he wishes to deal with it' but that 'war does  
not abide with a man only just as far as he wishes to  
deal with it,' in other words the stress lies on *καθ'*  
*ὅσον* not on *τις*. A sentence similar in form may be  
quoted from the speech of Euphemus to the  
Camarinaeans (vi. 87, 3) *καθ' ὅσον δέ τι ὁμῖν τῆς*  
*ἡμετέρας πολυπραγμοσύνης καὶ τρόπου τὸ αὐτὸ*  
*ἐμφέρεται, τοῦτ' ἀπολαβόντες χρήσασθε*, but there  
*τοῦτ'* refers clearly to *τι* *τῆς ἡμετέρας πολυ-*  
*πραγμοσύνης καὶ τρόπου* which is the leading phrase  
of the previous clause. Again, the objection to  
referring *τοῦτ'* to *μέρος*, as Arnold does, is the form  
of expression, for Poppo truly observes 'perversa  
videtur dicendi ratio ὁ πόλεμος ἐκτελεῖται τοῦτ' *τῷ*  
*μέρει τοῦ πολέμου.*'

I do not think *τοῦτ'* is sound. What is wanted  
is a correlative to *καθ' ὅσον* and Dobree is in the  
right direction with his suggestion of *οὔτω*. I would  
however prefer *ἐς τοῦτο* (= *ἐς τοσοῦτο μόνον*).

This is an improvement as far as it goes but even  
so the sentence is not quite satisfactory, for it is  
hardly sense to say that 'war does not abide (with  
any one) only so far as he wishes to deal with a part  
of it.' We expect either 'only so far as he wishes  
to deal with it' or 'only in that part in which he  
wishes to deal with it,' according to the second  
explanation of Schol. *μὴ καθ' ὅσον ἔν τις αὐτοῦ*  
*μεταχειρίζεται, ὅλον ναυμαχῶν ἢ πεζομαχῶν*. The  
expression in the text appears to be a contamination,  
and Poppo is sensible of this when he says that  
*μέρος* goes with *ὅσον* and is not the object of  
*μεταχειρίζειν*. But if so how does he deal with

αὐτοῦ? If αὐτοῦ depends on μέρος then μεταχειρίζειν is left without an object; if it is taken as object of μεταχειρίζειν the reply is that we always find an acc. with that verb in Thucydides.

I suggest that the clause originally ran τὸν τε πόλεμον νομίσωσι μὴ καθ' ὅσον ἂν τις αὐτὸν βούληται μεταχειρίζειν, ἐς τοῦτο ξυνεῖναι, and that αὐτοῦ μέρος was a marginal gloss on αὐτόν and afterwards superseded it in the text. Then ἐς τοῦτο was altered to τούτῳ to make a reference to μέρος. There is of course no difficulty in the omission of ἂν with νομίσωσι, and it can only be by an oversight that Mr. J. Donovan (*Cl. Rev.* ix. 148) has included νομίσωσι here among the 'Greek jussives.' In the last clause I take αὐτόν to refer to τὰ τοῦ πολέμου from the previous πόλεμον rather than to ἄνδρες implied in τις, 'according as the fortunes of war determine.'

R. C. SEATON.

\* \* \*

#### EMENDATION OF HOR. SAT. II. ii. 123, 124.

The difficult reading

post hoc ludus erat culpa potare magistra;  
ac venerata Ceres, ita culmo surget alto, etc.,

seems to be a corruption of

post hoc ludus erat vappam potare; magistra  
hac venerata Ceres, ita culmo surget alto, etc.

The scribe catching sight of 'culmo' in the following line would write 'culpum' for 'vappam.' This being untranslatable was altered to 'culpa' and the stop placed after 'magistra,' which was read as ablative, when 'hac' would appear an obvious mistake for 'ac,' which was accordingly read.

The translation will thus be:

'Our sport was then to quaff sour wine; and when we had thus done reverence to Ceres our queen, with a prayer that she would spring,' etc.

'hac' = 'vappa.'

For 'magistra Ceres' cf. Ov. Am. III. x. ii.

#### Prima Ceres docuit etc

and Tib. II. i. 37.

Rura cano, rurisque deos; his vita magistris, etc.

For the honouring of Ceres with wine cf. Verg. Georg. i. 343, 344.

cuncta tibi Cererem pubes agrestis adoret;  
cui tu lacte favos et miti dilue Baccho.

'Vappam' well completes the picture of frugal simplicity which Horace is here painting, cf. II. iii. 144.

J. R. COATES.

\* \* \*

#### AN UNNOTICED LATINISM IN LONGINUS.

In Longinus 'On the Sublime,' II. 2, we read as follows:—ἐγὼ δὲ ἐλεγχθήσεσθαι τοῦθ' ἐτέρως ἔχον φημί, εἰ ἐπισκέψαιτό τις, ὅτι ἡ φύσις, ὥσπερ τὰ πολλὰ ἐν τοῖς παθητικοῖς καὶ διηρμένους αὐτόνομον, οὕτως οὐκ εἰκαῖν τι καὶ παντὶς ἀμέθοδον εἶναι φιλεῖ, etc.

Here the meaning of ὥσπερ...οὕτως is obviously *although yet*, and I do not know that it has ever been taken in any other way. Roberts in his recent edition translates, 'But I maintain that this will be found to be otherwise if it be observed that *while* nature as a rule is free and independent in matters of passion and elevation, *yet* she is wont not to act at random and utterly without system' (p. 45).

There is no trouble about the sense, then, and the analogous Latin phrase *ita...ut* must occur to everyone. But after searching the grammars and lexicons, including Sophocles' *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, I have been unable to find any mention of ὥσπερ...οὕτως with this concessive force. It seems, therefore, that we have in this place a Latinism, which should be included in the list of 'examples of Latin influence upon Greek construction and phrasing,' given by Prof. Roberts on p. 188 of his edition.

H. J. EDMISTON.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.  
March 1, 1900.

## REVIEWS.

### TUCKER'S POETICS OF ARISTOTLE.

*Aristotelis Poetica*: textum recognovit etc.  
T. G. TUCKER. Nutt. 1899. Pp. 52.  
2s. 0d.

In this text of the *Poetics* with short critical notes Prof. Tucker appears as a bold innovator on two different lines. I do not include in these his transpositions of chapters or smaller passages, for Susemihl has adopted that course before him.

One is the typographical device by which very considerable parts of the text are printed in smaller type than the rest. He does not make the theory of the distinction perfectly clear, but his meaning seems to be

that some parts are more important than the rest and deserve to be made conspicuous, whereas there is a large amount of secondary argument and detail which ought to be thrown into the shade. There is also a third portion, chiefly Chh. 12 and 20, which he not only prints small in a third type, but brackets. If I understand him, he takes these passages to be unaristotelian, while the rest of the small print is Aristotelian but obscures the larger lines of the treatise on which we ought to fix our gaze. Probably most scholars would rather be left to judge for themselves as to the relative interest and importance of various parts; Mr.



Tucker however explains that he has chiefly in view those who are new to the study of Aristotle, and his typography is meant to help the beginner in seizing the main points. It is not altogether satisfactory to see Aristotle appearing like one of those school-books or manuals in which the young student is warned against attempting on a first reading to master the small print. The manual-writer, too, really means his small print to be passed over; we have no such assurance as to the wishes of Aristotle. Are we to have another new series of classical texts edited on this principle? The *Ethics* and the *Georgics*, Thucydides and Livy, would wear a very strange aspect.

The other direction in which innovation appears is that of conjectural emendation. I think myself that we are to some extent indebted to any scholar who has the courage on reasonable grounds to question tradition, even if his own suggestions are not thoroughly satisfactory. But on the other hand an emending scholar ought, when the text may be considered unsound, to show some clear probability about the exact change which he proposes to make; and though the text of the *Poetics* is often perplexing enough, I cannot think that here Prof. Tucker has really judged well. He is a very good scholar. Those who have read his *Supplices* do not need to be told that he is also very ingenious in his conjectures. But the conjectures that strike us as more than clever and possible, those that we feel to be in any degree convincing, are but a small fraction of the whole. What we think to ourselves is, 'Yes, Aristotle or Aeschylus might have written that, and this is something to say. But he might also have written many other things just as well, and you really give us no sufficient ground for thinking that what you propose is just the one thing he did write.' A scholar is indeed entitled to credit for not sitting down quietly, as most do, under some impossible or almost impossible phrase. But conviction of error is one thing, correction another, and perhaps it is wiser to stop at the first of these, unless we can offer a correction which has more than mere possibility in its favour.

I fear the general verdict on most of the suggestions made by Prof. Tucker will be that we cannot say this of them.

I give a list, not of all, but of the most important changes which he actually prints in his text of the first ten chapters. It may be remembered that some of them were put forward by him in vol. x. of this *Review* along with others that do not now appear.

1447 a 27 οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν ὀρχηστῶν. b 15 οὐχ ὡς χρῆν κατὰ μίμῃσιν. b 22 κατὰ ποῖον ποιητὴν προσαγορευτέον; 1448 a 16 ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇδὶ διαφορά. a 23 ἡ παράγοντα πάντας. b 22 φανερόν, ἐρᾶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς πεφικότες. 1449 a 8 κρίναι τί ἦν εἶναι καί. b 6 ἡ Ἐπίχαρμος. b 9 τοῦ ἐν μέτρῳ μετὰ λόγον μεγάλου. b 12 εἰ ἡ μὲν. 1450 a 12 οὐκ ὀλίγοι αὐτόνως ὡς εἶπεν. a 30 ποιήσει οὐδὲν ὃ ἦν. b 8 ἐν οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τι δῆλον. b 18 σὼς γάρ. b 39 χρόνῳ. 1451 b 31 γενέσθαι καὶ δι' αὐτὰ [γενέσθαι]. 1452 a 2 καὶ κάλλιον. a 16 πεπλεγμένη δὲ ἐκπληξίς. In the notes he further suggests: 1448 a 15 διαφέροντας (or ὑπερφύνας) Κύκλωπας. b 36 μιμήσεις δραματικὰς τῇ ἐποίησιν. 1451 a 3 καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ποιητῶν σιμμάτων. b 23 πάντως ἦν αἰεὶ.

Of all these I must own that only two or three attract me at all, the very small ones in 1449 b 6 and 12 (I had myself thought of the latter) and perhaps that in 1452 a 2. The first and third conjectures in the list I hardly understand. The use of τί ἦν εἶναι in 1449 a 8 strikes me as different from the way Aristotle handles his phrase. Does he ever employ anything like the τῇδὶ inserted in 1448 a 16 and 1449 b 19? His occasional τοδί is essentially different. I imagine such a τῇδὶ to be as little Aristotelian as the τοι (see Eucken) which Prof. Tucker introduces in two later passages (1454 a 23 and b 35). Few will approve the readings suggested in 1448 a 15, 1450 a 12, 1451 a 3, 1452 a 16. Speaking generally, one may say that there is too much imagination, not enough sense of the probabilities of things, and possibly not enough attention to other Aristotelian writings. But Prof. Tucker's work stimulates and sets us thinking even when we cannot readily assent to his conclusions.

H. RICHARDS.

## JAN'S MUSICI SCRIPTORES.

*Musici Scriptores Graeci*, recognovit, prooemiis et indice instruxit CAROLUS JAN. Supplementum, melodiarum reliquiae. Teubner, 1899. M. 1.20.

In this small volume of the Teubner series of texts—the number of pages is sixty in all—we have from the highly competent hand of Carl von Jan a complete collection of all the fragments of Greek music as yet discovered. In the case of such a book our chief duty is to recommend it to the attention of scholars. A few points may be noticed.

The fragment of the *Orestes* of Euripides the editor (following M. Gevaert) now pronounces to be in the Dorian 'mode'; that is to say, it is based on a scale of the Dorian species. On the question whether the genus is Chromatic or Enharmonic he decides in favour of the former. The mysterious Z is regarded by him (no doubt

rightly) as simply a mark of the end of the line.

The two Hymns to Apollo now appear in a much more complete form than has been possible hitherto. In the first Hymn a great improvement has been effected by the transposition of the two fragments. The process of filling up *lacunae* by conjecture has been carried on with great ingenuity and success.

The Seikilos inscription has now received the missing final note, which has so important a bearing on the tonality.

The three Hymns which for so long were the only specimens of Greek music have received some fresh light, especially from an article by M. Th. Reinach in the *Revue des études grecques* ix. (1896.) The observation of the law of accent has now drawn a distinction between this hymn and the others.

D. B. MONRO.

PETERSON'S *CLUENTIUS OF CICERO*.

*M. Tulli Ciceronis pro A. Cluentio Oratio*: edited with introduction and notes explanatory and critical, by W. PETERSON M.A., Hon. LL.D. St. Andrews and Princeton. Pp. lv, 271. London, Macmillan and Co. (*Classical Series*) 1899. 3s. 6d.

DR. PETERSON had laid all teachers of the classics under a debt of gratitude by his well-known translation of the *pro Cluentio*, which was revised and issued with certain notes in 1895. Some further comments of his, upon the text, appeared in this Review in June 1898. He has now followed up these prelusory labours by a new edition of the speech, in which he claims, not without reason, to have constituted the text on independent lines. What these lines are, will best be seen if we proceed to examine certain passages in the light of Dr. Peterson's criticism.

But it may be remarked, at the outset, that finality is not to be expected in the constitution of such a text as that of the *pro Cluentio*. There were, as Classen first pointed out in his edition of 1831, two

recensions of the text: the 'vulgate' as it is called, which is represented by the promiscuous crowd of codd. deteriores, and the superior recension represented by the MSS. known as ST. The latter is supported, on the whole, by P the fragmentary Turin Palimpsest of the 5th or 6th century, which itself however displeases us at times by its ineptitudes; e.g. §35 postulari (for post uiri): §92 om. natura: §101 praeferebatur (for proferebatur): §129 iuretur (for inuretur), §146 in mente (for sine mente). But in three or four cases P has yielded invaluable evidence e.g. §130 multitudini: nemini licitum: and it goes far to establish the value of the ST recension.

We find further evidence of the existence, in the 14th century or earlier, of a better recension or at least of some MS. from which marginal corrections were taken down in MSS. of the vulgate order of text. Dr. Peterson mentions (after Classen) the cod. S. Marci (b<sup>2</sup>). He further says (p. xliii)—'There was a codex S. Victoris, believed by Classen to have been used by Lambinus and collated also by Gulielmus': adding that Sylvius cites it in his edition of

1535, the earliest separate edition of the speech. It is strange that by a sort of tacit agreement among editors, the whereabouts of this manuscript is left in obscurity: and Dr. Peterson goes so far as to speak of it in the past tense. But I have recently examined with some care a MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (no. 14749, belonging originally to the Abbaye de Saint-Victor, suppressed at the Revolution), which appears to correspond in all respects to the missing codex. There are fifteen cases in which  $\Sigma$  (as I will call it) shows the readings (mostly in the margin, sometimes in the text) attributed by Gulielmus to the cod. S. Victoris: two cases in which it does not, viz. in not reading *et for sed* (§ 46) and *pronuntiari* (§ 73). This MS.  $\Sigma$  seems to be a patchwork by different hands. Its groundwork corresponds to the M family which Dr. Peterson indicates (p. xlii), showing traces of the four lacunae characteristic of that group. These lacunae however are filled up by very apparent patches: e.g. in § 102 after '*agerent quod nos*' appears an erased line '*quaerit qualis uir*'...from § 107, and continued by the correct insertion '*in tota causa*' etc. on the top of the next folio, in paler ink. There are similar traces of disturbance at § 127. The lacunae §§ 149-154, §§ 176-182 are filled up by an inserted page in either case. The closing pages, from § 198 *incidit in quo* to the end of the speech, are similarly inserted.

Though the text of  $\Sigma$  agrees in the main with that of M, there are cases in which it contradicts it: e.g. § 47 *ad* (ob STFM), § 64 *inimicus*  $\Sigma$ ST *iniquus* FM: § 104 *accepisse* a Cluentio HS CCCC,  $\Sigma$ ST (here correct edd. who say ST soli); *ib. aliud* is  $\Sigma$ SF. It appears therefore to have some independent value. But its main interest is to be found in its marginal corrections. These appear to have been inserted by more hands than one: a few are written in a very faint ink, whereas the greater part are as clear as the text. Sometimes the emendation promised by an '*al.*' in the margin has not been filled in at all. But these emendations with little exception confirm STb<sup>2</sup>: but note § 33 *possit*  $\Sigma$  marg. S, § 48 *esse* *dicet*  $\Sigma$ <sup>m</sup> S, § 49 *hic cum causa* Fabricius  $\Sigma$ <sup>m</sup> (*hic cum causa* C. Fabr. T); § 53 *hoc quo visus venire* *posset*  $\Sigma$ <sup>m</sup>, *hoc quovis usus venire* *posset* T: § 72 *plane*  $\Sigma$ <sup>m</sup>F, *planius* ST: § 113 *potuerunt*, or *putaret*, both in  $\Sigma$ <sup>m</sup>, while  $\Sigma$  text has *potuit aliqui*, STb<sup>2</sup> *putaretur*.

It may surely then be fairly contended that we have in  $\Sigma$  an additional witness to the best text current in MSS. of the ST type,

a MS. which in its own text follows, but not invariably, the tradition which we have in the Laurentian eleventh century MS. M, the omitted passages (and possibly certain readings) being taken by the scribe from a second MS. before him (such as F), perhaps, indeed, from two combined: for those passages exhibit once or twice the ST tradition. When it comes to the marginalia, we are driven to the conclusion that the whole speech was carefully collated more than once with a MS. of the ST order. It is disappointing no doubt to find little or nothing that is new in the readings whether of margins or text. The MSS. of Cicero have been so thoroughly worked over, from the ninth century onwards, that this was only to be expected: and such scholars as Dr. Peterson address themselves to the task of conjectural emendation. Of all such work the remark of Lehmann (quoted in Mr. A. C. Clark's *pro Milone* p. xlix) holds good: 'in all cases where we have not such good MSS. [as in the *de Senectute*] criticism builds upon an insecure foundation; a conjecture may be put forward which suits the sense, but is not convincing, since the readings before us are themselves the deposit of an ancient and intelligently-formed recension.'

The soundest part of such emendation seems (to the present writer) to be that which concerns itself with intrusions into the text: glosses and 'index-words' in particular. Thus Dr. Peterson condemns '*agitur causa*' in § 58 as a marginal guide which has slipped into the text; and in § 72 *queritur se ab Opp. destitutum*; better than Madvig, who proposed to excise '*sese ab Opp. destitutum*' below.

There are four cases in the speech in which the question of reading turns on the omission of *non*: § 34 *non longe animo prospexisse*, ST $\Sigma$ <sup>m</sup>, *longe a. pr. P.*, codd. rel.; § 47 *medico non ignobili sed spectato homine* ST $\Sigma$ <sup>m</sup> *ignobili sed* FM $\Sigma$ : § 67 *non ignoratis* ST, *ignoratis* codd. reliqui; § 127 *comperisse*, codd. omnes, but *non comperisse* conj. Graevius. In the first of these Dr. Peterson follows ST: in § 47, he reads *non ignobili*, *spectato homine*, as an instance of the appositional *homo* or *uir*: in § 67 all edd. read the *non*: in § 127 Dr. Peterson, with Classen and Baiter, follows the MSS., reading *sese* however for *esse*. On this we may remark, first of all, that the omission of *non* by all MSS. proves very little: it is not unfrequent; cp. *Plane*, § 44 where the best MSS. omit an indispensable *non*. Next, Dr. Peterson's exegesis of the passage is not very clear: *duos esse...dicant* clearly corresponds

to aut illud adferant, and yet he inserts a mark of interrogation, on the ground that the videlicet of the following words implies an answer to a question. But the sense is 'The censors must say that two alone were guilty: obviously then (videlicet) the rest of the jurors voted honestly.' To proceed: Dr. Peterson renders his text (aut illud adferant sq.) 'or else they must make the allegation that they ascertained some fact implicating the others.' This rendering is surely unsatisfactory: adferre is hardly 'to make an allegation' but to 'produce as evidence' or simply to 'bring forward a plea': (Lucr. iii., 354, adf. = rationem adferre, 'to give an explanation'). Again, why aliquid and not id or idem? With the other reading, we get a clear sense 'or else they must plead that they had not actually brought home to the rest the charge which they had effectually proved (habuerint compertum) against Aquilius and Gutta.' The contrast between the two forms of perfect favours this view. It suggests, as the second alternative open to the censors, that they should say 'Two at least are *proved* guilty: of the rest we have our suspicions.' Dr. Reid (ap. Peterson 'Translation' p. 153) confirms this reading by reference to § 131 nihil ipsos habuisse cogniti, nihil comperti.

In § 37 the reading of Müller is accepted, atque ubi pernoctarat ibi diem: I had read atque ubi pernoctaret ibi diem, following P, which involves the doubtful tense pernoctaret. Comparing the MS. readings ibi pernoctaret ibi diem ST ibi pernoctaret et ibi diem FM ibi pernoctaret et ibidem WΣ which all support the imperfect tense, I now think that we should read (as Classen) atque ibi pernoctaret, ibi diem posterum commoraretur: the more so as the sequence of the clauses is Ciceronian, cum esset apud mulierculam atque ibi...commoraretur, cp. Phil. ii, § 77, delituit in cauponula atque ibi...perpotavit, Catil. iii, § 5.

In § 66 vos quaeso...item quae reliqua sunt audiat is read, as against STΣ<sup>m</sup> ut item, on the ground that to explain the latter 'one would have to suppose that vos is direct acc. after quaeso and that it takes the ordinary government of verbs of asking': this, it is said, quaeso can only take when coupled with oro, precor and the like. It is true that quaeso ab aliquo is the ordinary construction: but in Sex. Rosc. § 11 we have te...M. Fanni quaeso ut qualem te...praebeuisti...talem te...impertias. In § 112 parenthetic quaero (not, as usual, quaeso) read by FMWΣ is cut out by Dr. Peterson, following ST because it 'could not

stand parenthetically in such a context,' and may be due to a marginal adscript *quaere*.

In § 84 the words istam dedit conciliationis et gratiae fabulam (om. ST) are retained, in spite of the banality of the repetition of conciliationem gratiae two lines above. In Σ<sup>m</sup> we have istam ultro dedit: which may suggest, as the original, excogitavit ultro, sive, ut homines tum loquebantur, a P. Cethego admonitus. The suspected words, istam...fabulam are surely some scribe's adaptation of the idea in explosum et eiecum est (§ 86).

In § 86 the excision of qui cum matre, as 'the remains of an adscript,' is to be regretted: I have nothing to add to my critical note on the passage, unless it be to say that a passing hit at Sassia is never out of place (cp. § 18 init.) and that Σ has qui cum matre *insere* haerebat, Σ<sup>m</sup> has *insere* habebat simulatates; another Paris MS. (no. 17883) has a corruption of the true reading, qui cum in re haerebat. In § 94 the latter MS. may be held to support the reading of ST placatum, by its paccatum: it certainly is the only MS. that reads pudens, which most edd. adopt: Dr. Peterson has prudens and pacatum. The emendation in § 98 quid? accusati sunt (qui acc. s. *codd.*) is not convincing: Mr. Lendrum's view, that the relative introduces a refutation (Hermathena vi. p. 358) is more satisfactory (he cp. § 91 quae res fraudi fuit and qui tum interlitus): otherwise atqui would suit better than quid? In § 116 the interesting emendation of Dr. Postgate non remittunt (MSS. non admittunt) is discussed but put aside. It has much to recommend it. The accepted text represents a litis aestimatio as invariably either *lenient* to a fault or negligent. But Cic. is arguing that a certain *severe* litis aestimatio was no iudicium; and we are landed in the supposition 'that the most skilful of advocates starts in his task of minimising the importance of a severe lit. aest. by suggesting that a large number of these assessments of penalty are too mild' (Journal of Philol. xxvi. p. 89). We can only, with Dr. Peterson, reply that the fact is mentioned merely as an illustration of neglectantia: which is rather strained, especially as Cic. goes on to give instances of *severe* lit. aestimationes: which agrees better with non remittunt 'refuse to mitigate the penalty.' In Σ<sup>m</sup> we find non amittunt, which might be taken to support the emendation.

But so many interesting points are raised



by Dr. Peterson's notes on this admirable speech

singula dum capti circumvectamur amore that we have already exceeded the bounds of a review. Reference may be made to the adoption of in eo loco § 65, the attempt to supply the lacuna in § 103 (which, however, does nothing more than others to mark the transition from the first trial of Fidiculanus Falcula to the second), the defence of accusavit ut cum in § 150, of at heres est C. in § 165, the excision, in § 173 (the poisoning passage), of faciliusne potuit quam in poculo as mere 'index-words' from the margin. The last is not a convincing solution of a passage which Lambinus despaired of emending: but it may point the way to a remedy; one might prefer to keep the triple question (faciliusne...latius...celerius...) and to throw out facilius fallere in pane si esset animadversum quam in poculo, which is really self-contradictory. In § 192 an emendation of an equally unsatisfactory passage is suggested which merits attention.

The Introduction gives a useful summary of the facts of the iudicium Iunianum and the praeiudicia of which so much is made by the orator. The technical question relating to the lex Cornelia de sicariis is fully discussed; the value of Cicero's argument is examined. The Scamander incident is set in a clearer light: the meaning of § 47 pecunia obsignata quae ob eam rem ('for the deed') is determined, though adferre (§ 53) in the sense 'to administer' might have been illustrated (e.g. Cael. § 31); nor is it explained why Scamander had the poison on him as well as the money when he

was caught, when it was Diogenes who was to administer it. (Probably Cicero's story is intentionally confused.)

One last point. In § 163 Ambivium (T.) is preferred to A. Bivium (SMΣ). The true reading is, I believe, Abivium which is found in a Brit. Mus. cod. (Burn 159): and we have here a pun like those in § 72. This is a copo de via Latina, who has been making himself disagreeable: 'if he invites us into his hostelry we shall give him such a reception that he will be sorry he has gone out of his way'; the words de via (Latina) decessisse contain a play upon the name Abivius (abire via).

This Edition makes a distinct contribution to the solution of the difficulties of the pro Cluentio: which is high praise in the case of a speech for which so much had already been done by the successive labours of scholars. It can hardly be regarded as the last word of the higher scholarship on this speech. The interpretation of the pro Cluentio is one of those classical tasks, such as the translation of the Odes of Horace, which have a peculiar attraction for scholars and provide a touchstone of criticism. But we may hope that Principal Peterson will address himself next to some res integra. There are speeches of Cicero which still await an editor.

The only misprints which I have noticed are as follows: p. xli., middle, for § 149 read § 145; p. xlii. for -egrinus read egimus; p. 28 cr. n., for 6 read 9; p. 34 cr. n. on 18, correct thus 'alia most codd.; aliqua some edd.' (Σ M have aliqua); p. 249 middle, read pane for pace.

W. YORKE FAUSSET.

#### SHOREY'S ODES AND EPODES OF HORACE.

*Horace: Odes and Epodes*, edited with Introduction and Notes by PAUL SHOREY, Ph.D., Professor in the University of Chicago. Sanborn & Co., Boston, U.S.A. 1898. Pp. xxxvii, 487.

THE friend of American freedom will welcome in this edition one of the fast accumulating proofs that the trans-Atlantic domination of Berlin and Göttingen is on the decline. In its practical and its literary character it bears the unmistakable impress of the Anglo-Saxon genius. It forms part of a series entitled the *Students' Series of Latin Classics*, and judged from the standard

of the students' needs it may be truly said to have realized the promise of its motto, οὐ πολλά' ἀλλὰ πολύ. The distinguishing feature of the book is its 'literary' character. Dr. Shorey in his preface does not deprecate this description; only by means of an illustration from the French, which I must transcribe for the delectation of readers of the *Classical Review* who do not know it already, he explains in what sense his edition is not a literary one.

*Ecce autem a Tenedo gemini tranquilla per alta.*  
*Ecce autem!* Les voilà, ce sont eux! *A Tenedo;*  
c'est de Ténédos qu'ils arrivent; on les aperçoit de loin; *gemi*; ils sont deux; ils forment un couple!

*Ambo* serait faible ; mais *gemini* ! *Tranquilla per alta* ; c'est la haute mer ; elle est tranquille, et les deux monstres s'avancent. Quel tableau !<sup>1</sup>

From these scenic methods the interpretation of Dr. Shorey is far removed. He has a fine ear and a delicate touch ; and he understands how in matters exegetical the half is often far better than the whole. His lightness of hand is perhaps best shown by quotation. Two successive notes, on iii. 3. 38 and 40, are '*exsules* : slightly spiteful' [it will be remembered Juno is the speaker] 'and with *beati* a faint oxymoron' — '*busto* : Vergil's *iacet ingens litore truncus*, etc. (*Aen.* 2. 557) was not yet published to preoccupy the imagination.' Here Dr. Shorey's brevity is conspicuous : but he does not show to less advantage where he is fuller. And he is fuller where, for example, ample illustration of Horace's diction or style is the true economy. Witness his excellent note on i. 32. 9 where he shows in elucidation of a general discussion in the preface that the single word *udus* represents in Horace as many as eight Greek words, *ἀλίκλυστος*, *διερός*, *βεβρεγμένος*, *ἐλώδης*, *ὕγρὸς*, *εὐνδρος*, *ἔφνδρος*, *ἡρόεις*. Notes of this kind are not merely scholarly : they breed scholarship.

The literary taste and feeling displayed throughout this commentary make its occasional lapses into the tricks of English speech, of which American scholars have not as yet divested themselves, all the more irritating. *E.g.* 'For knocking with foot, cf. *Plaut. Most.* 444 ; *Callim. Hym. Apoll.* 3. Observe alliteration.' p. 159. We might parody Dr. Shorey on i. 32. 9 and say 'Note American poverty of articles.' On III. 3. 12 we read 'we may choose between the "purple light" of youth, the halo of apotheosis, and a "purple-stained mouth from a beaker full of the true, the blushful Hippocrene"' (p. 312). 'Blushful Hippocrene,' ye Muses ! These may be small matters, it is true ; but they are as sand in the eye.

Other English editions of Horace have shown literary tact and insight perhaps as great as Dr. Shorey's, though they have not equalled his brevity. But in another feature of the 'literary' edition he is without a rival. It was his aim to stimulate the student's appreciation of the *Odes* by a somewhat fuller illustration than 'is generally given of Horace's thought, sentiment and poetic imagery.' This aim he has attained by means of copious quotations from English metrical versions and ample illustration of

his thoughts and diction from modern English and foreign poets. I do not wish to suggest that ancient illustrations are absent or in defect. There is an ample store of these also ; but they do not constitute so distinguishing a feature in the book. It is hard here to say whether we should admire more the stores of elegant learning from which the editor has drawn or the judgment with which he has made his selection. The result is beyond all question. Dr. Shorey's book cannot fail to stimulate in its every reader a fuller, a deeper and a more vivid appreciation of the art and poetry of Horace. So much do I feel this that I assume the role of censor with considerable reluctance ; but the ungracious task cannot be altogether declined.

The study of all classics, we know, has two main branches, criticism and exposition. With neither can it dispense any more than Euclid with his problems or his theorems ; though the Q.E.F. of the unbridled critic and the Q.E.D. of the unabashed interpreter have often produced the illusion that it can. Every man (the exceptions may for present purposes be neglected) leans naturally in the one direction or the other ; the inclination of Dr. Shorey (he would presumably admit it himself, see Pref. p. vii), is to exposition. We do not mean that he presents an impervious carapace to critical arguments. He discriminates between the alternatives which dissension in the manuscripts offers ; and usually his election is right. Occasionally even where they are unanimous he leaves them and adopts a conjecture ; sometimes a mistaken one as at *Epodes* v. 87 where he accepts Haupt's *maga non*. But his heart is in the other camp : and if the student desires to understand the real critical issues in a difficult and disputed passage, he must go elsewhere : he will not get enlightenment from Dr. Shorey. And here I must pause to touch upon a very subtle danger to criticism which the free use of modern parallels involves. A quotation from a modern writer brings home to the reader's mind the thought which the citer desires to suggest with a force and vividness that no ancient quotation can match. Such an appeal is apt to sweep reason from her feet while the mind forgets that the modern may have misunderstood or misrepresented the ancient and that at any rate he is a modern after all.

I would purposely illustrate the first possibility by two instances which have no special bearing upon contested points of

<sup>1</sup> M. Sarcey, *Souvenirs de Jeunesse*, p. 180.

Horatian interpretation. The volume of Longfellow's poems entitled *Ultima Thule* contains a poem upon Jugurtha which a well known poet and critic of poetry, Mr. E. W. Gosse, singled out when the book first appeared for high commendation. It runs as follows :

How cold are thy baths, Apollo !  
Cried the African monarch, the splendid,  
As down to his death in the hollow,  
Dark dungeons of Rome he descended,  
Uncrowned, unthroned, unattended.  
How cold are thy baths, Apollo !

How cold are thy baths, Apollo !  
Cried the poet, unknown, unbefriended,  
As the vision that lured him to follow,  
With the mist and the darkness blended ;  
And the dream of his life was ended.  
How cold are thy baths, Apollo !

As a matter of fact, Jugurtha's exclamation when thrust into the cold, dark prison was not 'How cold are thy baths, Apollo,' but (addressing his Roman gaolers) 'Jove ! How cold your bath is !' Ἡράκλεις, ἔπειν, ὡς ψυχρὸν ὑμῶν τὸ βαλανεῖον, Plutarch *Marius* c. 12. If the poetic mind works so freely with a plain narrative of fact, how watchful must we be of comparisons which suggest that it will render faithfully an ancient conception from the nebulous regions of sentiment and fancy ? Few poets have had a finer knowledge of the ancient poets than Tennyson. He sings of an 'island-valley' with 'bowery hollows crowned with summer seas,' just as Homer had sung of an island, τὴν περὶ πόντος ἀπείροτος ἰστροφάνωται. The resemblance is obvious : and the difference. We may hope that, if Tennyson had been translating the *Odyssey*, he would have avoided a word which carries an idea of 'surmounting' absent from the Homeric verb.

To return to Horace and Dr. Shorey, I would refer first to i. 23, 5, 6 where, in the words of the Preface p. vii., the rival readings are 'briefly discussed.' Of the *uepris—ad ventum* of Bentley he writes that it is 'ingenious and smoothly parallel with *rubum dimovere* below'—a mode of phrasing which would reveal the editor's preference, even if the description of the vulgate reading as 'this bold and beautiful expression' had not preceded. Two arguments against the vulgate are mentioned ; that trees have no leaves in spring, i. 4, 11 being cited on the other side, and that in spring the does have no fawns, to which no answer is made. I do not know if Dr. Shorey would accept the explanation of a German (ap. Orelli) that Horace refers to hardened fawns of two

or three years old. Then are quoted Rossetti Love's Nocturne 'When in groves the gracile spring | Trembles': Swinburne, *Atalanta*, 'When the hounds of spring are on winter's traces | The mother of months in meadow or plain | Fills the shadows and windy places | With *lisp of leaves* (his italics) and ripple of rain.' And for *adventus* is quoted Milton's 'Far off his coming shone.' And in all this the vital issues are never even touched ; that, bold and beautiful as the image may be, the boldness and beauty is not that of ancient poetry while its indirectness and irrelevance is as alien to the classical spirit as is the '*lisp of leaves*' which Dr. Shorey italicises and 'the hounds of spring' which he does not, and that modern reminiscences of the vulgate reading have no weight as evidence in its favour. These and similar considerations can never be lost sight of in comparisons of ancient and modern poetry. Matthew Arnold transforms two words of Horace *Oceano dissociabili* into the noble line 'The unplumbed, salt, estranging sea.' We may hold the English to be more poetical, but its beauty should not blind us as critics to the different canons that must be applied to an original, which states the relevant fact and has done.

In the passage first discussed the vulgate gives poetry and sense, though sense and poetry alien to Horace ; at i. 35. 22 *sqq.* it gives neither. Here is Dr. Shorey's paraphrase : 'Hope and white-robed Faith follow "the fortunes of a fallen lord" and withhold not their companionship even when Fortune (the great divinity) grows hostile (*inimica*), and his *personal Fortune* (my italics) puts on mourning and leaves the once lordly home.' Mr. Page, whom our editor has used and not unfrequently cites, has admitted the harshness and awkwardness of this double role of Fortune : but Dr. Shorey has no qualms. 'Perfect consistency' (the euphemism is charming) 'is not attained, but the meaning is clear.' Yes, we may rejoin, when you have juggled in the second *Fortuna*, and imputed to literary Latin the loose habits of English expression. But not till then. The place in his commentary on the Odes, however, where we most miss the critical faculty is iv. 8. Dean Wickham is the only modern editor of Horace known to me who has conscientiously grappled with the difficulties of this composition ; and the results are full of significance to the discerning. But Dr. Shorey does not face the problems : he simply smooths them out of sight. I end with an example from the Epodes. The MS. read-

ing at vii. 11 sq. 'neque hic lupis mos nec fuit leonibus, | *umquam* nisi in dispar feris' could be defended if it were credible that Horace used *umquam* interrogatively with *feris*. But Dr. Shorey's solution is this: '*Umquam*, besides doing duty with *mos fuit*, is felt as *numquam* with *feris* owing to the position of *neque*: never fierce to their own kind (except to their unlike).' Will Prof. Shorey frankly say what language he would address to a member of his own class who wrote, and thus defended, the Latin which their professor attributes to Horace sooner than admit that the manuscripts have lost a single letter at the beginning of a line?

I have said that generally Dr. Shorey chooses rightly between the MS. readings; so I will add some exceptions. i. 3. 19 *l. turbidum* (cf. Propert. 3. 3. 24 'medio maxima turba mari est'); iii. 14. 6 *l. diuis*; iv. 4. 36. *l. indecorant*. Sometimes his choice is better than his reasons. There is no necessity to leave the MSS. at i. 2. 39 *Mauri peditis* 'the unhorsed Moor.' At the present time the *acer uultus* of a horse-soldier whose charger has been killed by the foeman who lies bleeding at his feet needs no illustration to make it intelligible. But the explanation preferred by the editor is 'The *Mauri* were fierce enough and *may well have used foot soldiers*' (my italics)—to the young student especially a demoralising comment.

Occasionally Dr. Shorey is too brief. The

note on iv. 6. 17 '*palam*: with *captis*, antithesis to *falleret*' is right as far as it goes. But, in view of the difficulty which competent critics have found with *captis*, it should have been pointed out that the stress of the sentence lies in the participle and that the finite verb with all that follows *palam captis* (= *ui aperta captis*) has no logical relation to the preceding stanza, and in English must be rendered by a separate sentence. I have noticed few slips or palpable errors: but *caprea* (iv. 4. 14) is not a *kid* (p. 406). Nor (on the same passage) should *uitulus*, iv. 2. 60, be cited as proof that *fulvae* is a possible epithet of a *goat*. We gain nothing by quoting one of Ovid's derivations for *Quirites* to justify the epithet *bellicosus* iii. 3. 57. In the time of Horace *Quirites* was a distinctively civil appellation. Here of course it is a synonym for *Romani*. Dr. Shorey's spelling is generally correct; but he does not follow the best MSS. in writing *montis* (i. 2. 8) and the like, and he fluctuates between *umor* and *humor*. His *metre* for *metre* will not be approved on this side of the Ocean: it too painfully suggests the gas-man. The book deserves an index; and an index of first lines would be a useful addition.

In parting from Dr. Shorey, I would say that if I were limited to three editions of the Odes, his would be one.

J. P. POSTGATE.

#### TREMENHEERE'S CYNTHIA OF PROPERTIUS.

*The Cynthia of Propertius*, done into English verse by SEYMOUR GREIG TREMENHEERE, one of H.M. Inspectors of Schools. Macmillan and Co., London and New York. 1899. pp. xiii. 108. 4s. net.

'SCHOLARS will pardon an attempt, however bald, to render into English these exquisite love-poems.' Why? Those who have no Latin may pardon such an attempt, if they like bad verses better than silence; but I do not know why bald renderings of exquisite love-poems should be pardoned by those who want no renderings at all. One who cannot read or understand

omniaque ingrato largibar munera somno,  
munera de prono saepe uoluta sinu,

may perhaps pardon the translation

Ungrateful sleep! Give all I could,  
Roll from your lap my presents would!

But who else? only the personage of whom Heine tells us 'c'est son métier.' Some bald renderings there are which even scholars will pardon: when Mr Paley sings 'It is present to me to feel the chill, the very severe chill, of a hostile public executioner,' or Mr Buckley 'They cut off his ears and nostrils with the sharp brass; but he, injured in his feelings, went about, enduring that calamity with a frantic mind,' scholars are as grateful as other folk; but Mr Tremeneere never rejoices the heart like this, though he does write 'To eclipse your honoured uncle strive' and ask 'Is yours the



spirit that can brave The hard bunk and the howling wave?'

The chief merit of his version is its admirable and even surprising conciseness: he has chosen his metre ill, for our octosyllabic couplet is not only as much unlike the elegiac as one couplet can be unlike another, but also affords very little room; yet nothing essential is omitted, except now and then the definite article. The phrasing too is often pointed; but it mostly wants grace and finish and is sometimes ugly: 'When, Gallus, stuttering and agasp, You languished in the damsel's clasp,' 'And, by Hylaeus bludgeoned well, Lay groaning on the Arcadian fell.' Where everything else is sacrificed to smartness and 'illa suis uerbis cogat amare Iouem' is rendered 'She'd coax the devil to her feet,' some will admire; but there is nothing smart about slang terms like 'cut' and 'wig': they misrepresent Propertius, who is not a colloquial writer but literary to a fault, and they are repulsive. Misrepresentation of Propertius is indeed the capital defect of this performance: good or bad, in movement, in diction, in spirit, it is unlike the original. I will quote some verses from the second poem, which is much the best translated:

Life of my life, why court applause  
In fluttering folds of Coan gauze,  
With Syrian scent on plaits and curls  
And all the gauds of foreign girls?

\* \* \*

What beauties e'er with Nature's vied?—  
Wild ivy, meadows gaily pied,  
Lone dells with beauteous berries fraught,  
Clear streams that find their way untaught,  
Bright shores with native gems self-strewn,  
And birds that never learnt a tune!  
'Twas not their toilets that did win  
Leucippus' daughters each her Twin:  
It was not for a powdered face  
That Pelops came so far to race;  
Nor Idas with Apollo vied  
To bear Marpessa off a bride.

Excellent: the rendering is close and deft, the English is pure, the phrasing neat, the lines run well; but what was the Latin? elegiacs by Propertius or hendecasyllables by Martial?

A text is printed opposite the translation, and there are notes at the end.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

#### THE NEW ANTHOLOGIA OXONIENSIS.

*Nova Anthologia Oxoniensis.* Translations into Greek and Latin Verse. Edited by ROBINSON ELLIS, M.A., Corpus Professor of Latin and Fellow of Corpus Christi College, and A. D. GODLEY, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford. Clarendon Press. MDCCCXCIX. 7s. 6d. net.

THE New Oxford Anthology is a beautiful volume. Its size, shape, paper and printing, invite and allure the reader, and its contents—ranging from the earliest to the most modern poetry—make it highly attractive to the lover of literature, even apart from its interest as a choice collection of Greek and Latin versions which may be regarded as representative of contemporary Oxonian scholarship. In the way in which it fulfils this its primary purpose the book surpasses expectation, however high—ἀκοῆς κρείσσον ἐς πέρας ἔρχεται—but not μόνης τῶν νῦν, for has not Cambridge recently given us proof, as delightful as convincing, that the reeds of the Cam are still as musically vocal as ever?

To select is difficult when every piece shows finished scholarship and taste; but it will guide our readers to be told that they may look for the most daring and novel experiments among the contributions of Gilbert Murray, recently Professor of Greek in Glasgow, and W. R. Hardie, now Professor of Humanity in Edinburgh. The Latin translations are more numerous by forty than the Greek (107 to 67), and conspicuous among them are W. R. Hardie's charming versions from the prose of George Meredith, Thackeray and Jonson into hexameters which catch exactly the true note—the *vrai air*—of Horace's Epistles. We have from the same hand some dignified tragic Latin iambs (cviii.) and a very successful Greek choral ode (cxli.). Another most brilliant specimen of this kind of composition—unessayed hitherto in Anthologies—is by Gilbert Murray (lxii.). His rendering of a fine poem by Shelley breathes the very spirit and *afflatus* of the Greek choral ode. Indeed, whatever style of Greek or Latin poetry he takes for his

model he appeals with unfailing success to one's sense of beauty and of scholarship. His Theocritean rendering of Tennyson's exquisite 'Come down, O Maid' is a masterpiece. E. D. A. Morshead's anapaestic ode (lviii.) has also caught the spirit of Greek tragedy most successfully. We wish that admirable composer, A. Sidgwick, had adopted the lyric ode in his wonderfully ingenious attempt to render Browning's 'O lyric love' (xviii.). In spite of his remarkable skill in the handling of it, the Greek hexameter refuses to respond to the half-expressed hints, the half-conceived figures, the vague yet suggestive yearnings of the nineteenth-century psychological analyst. The translating into Greek or Latin is often the best test of the original poem, how far the writer has succeeded in envisaging his images and disentangling his 'complicated state of mind.' The rendering into another tongue supplies a kind of *lapis Lydius ad quem ingenia sanabilia explorentur*. We cannot conceive any Greek writer in hexameters (at least of those who have come down to us) expatiating in reflections which might conceivably have floated before the δαυλοὶ πραπίδων δάσκιόι τε πόροι of an Aeschylean chorus. In commenting on the *Cambridge Compositions* we ventured to make a similar remark on a poem by Oliver Wendell Holmes, strangely selected by Mr. Lyttelton as a test piece for translation into Latin elegiacs. We could not conceive a Latin elegiac poet expressing an aspiration that Memory's hand should restore the light of departed days from Time's grey urn. A rendering seemed impossible because the poet had not succeeded in expressing anything. In like manner the poem of Browning suggests many reflections but has not succeeded in expressing them. The Greek hexameter is again applied unsuitably, as it seems to us, but again with amazing scholarship and skill, by T. L. Agar to Goldsmith's 'Village Master' (lxxxiii.).

Another rare and successful experiment is the piece in Latin comic trochaic septenarii merging into cretics, by that accomplished Plautine scholar, W. M. Lindsay (l.). Perhaps the most attractive of Robinson Ellis's contributions—which are not as numerous as we should desire—is his version in Asclepiads (v.). But should not the number of lines in the Latin be divisible evenly by four, according to Meineke's canon, in a piece modelled on Horace's odes? Another very graceful piece by him is his translation into scazons of Pope's epitaph on Gay:

## PAGE 110. LXI.

Of Manners gentle, of Affections mild;  
In Wit, a Man; Simplicity, a Child:  
With native Humour temp'ring virtuous  
Rage,  
Form'd to delight at once and lash the  
age:  
Above Temptation, in a low Estate,  
And uncorrupted, ev'n among the Great:  
A safe Companion, and an easy Friend,  
Unblamed thro' life, lamented in thy End.  
These are thy Honours! not that here thy  
Bust  
Is mix'd with Heroes, or with Kings thy  
dust;  
But that the Worthy and the Good shall  
say,  
Striking their pensive bosoms—*Here* lies  
GAY.

POPE.

O moribus iucunde, mitis adfectu,  
candore puerum qui refers, viros mente,  
tuo lepore temperans probas iras,  
saeculum iuvare natus et secare idem;  
te non egestas subditum tulit nummis,  
neque optimatum blanda cura corrumpit;  
sed qui fuisti fidus ac sine offensa,  
vivum fovebant, mortuum dolent omnes.  
haec laus tibi ingens; non quod hic tuum  
marmor  
contingit ossa principum, cinis reges;  
sed innocens quod omnis et pius dicet  
dolore pulsans pectus, Hic iaces, Gai.

Perhaps the most perfect of many very finished compositions by the other editor, A. D. Godley, that accomplished scholar and dextrous parodist, who may be called the Oxford Calverley, is the scene between Gaunt and Bolingbroke (xlvi.). It corresponds almost exactly to the original in the number of lines (36 = 35). The absence of this correspondence is the only defect, if indeed it can be called a defect, in H. W. Greene's masterly senarii on p. 33 (30 = 23), and those on p. 15 (24 = 16) by J. G. Sargent, whose Greek and Latin verses in this volume are worthy of his perfect prose compositions already published, and no higher praise could be bestowed.

Not only the length but the uniform excellence of the compositions renders quotation undesirable and difficult, but we ask leave to put before our readers a short version by A. D. Godley of a clever epigram by another great Oxford man, Goldwin Smith:

## PAGE 264. CLXIX.

Ἐν μεγάροισι πατρὸς βίος ἦν ἡδίστος Ἴάνθης,  
ἀλλ' ὅγε νῦν ἔλθων ἐν προθύρῳ Θάνατος.

ἡ δὲ καλυψαμένη πομπὸν μετὰ νηλέα βαίνει  
 ἐντροπαλιζομένη, μητρὸς ὀρεξαμένη,  
 ὀλβια πολλὰ λιποῦσα καὶ ἡβην ἱμερόεσσαν  
 ἐκ δὲ δόμον σβέσσας δᾶδ' Ὑμέναιος ἔβη.  
 G. S.

Sedibus in patriis felix vivebat Ianthe :  
 Mors vocat ad primas visa venire fores :  
 respicit illa quidem matremque invita re-  
 linquit,  
 obducto sequitur sed tamen ore ducem.  
 gaudia fugerunt vitae dulcisque iuventas :  
 et procul extinctas fers, Hymenaeae, faces.

And the following version by Sir Alfred Milner will have an interest added to its intrinsic merit :

## PAGE 266. CLXXI.

But oh, that deep romantic chasm which  
 slanted  
 Down the green hill athwart a cedarn  
 cover !  
 A savage place, as holy and enchanted  
 As e'er beneath a waning moon was haunted  
 By woman wailing for her demon lover.  
 And from this chasm, with ceaseless tur-  
 moil seething,  
 As if this earth in fast thick pants were  
 breathing,  
 A mighty fountain momentarily was forced :  
 Amid whose swift, half-intermitted burst  
 Huge fragments vaulted like rebounding  
 hail,  
 Or chaffy grain beneath the thresher's  
 flail.  
 And 'mid these dancing rocks at once and  
 ever  
 It flung up momentarily the sacred river.  
 Five miles meandering with a mazy motion  
 Through wood and dale the sacred river  
 ran,  
 Then reached the caverns measureless to  
 man,  
 And sank in tumult to a lifeless ocean :  
 And 'mid this tumult Kubla heard from far  
 Ancestral voices prophesying war.

COLERIDGE.

## PAGE 267. CLXXI.

Quae deinde intulerit facies se mira, quis  
 audet  
 dicere? nam viridi devolsum colle barathrum  
 transversas aperit fauces cedrisque minatur  
 adpositis : asper visu diraque verendus  
 religione locus, qualem, dum contrahit ignis  
 Cynthia, desertis implebat vocibus Ino.  
 at barathro ex imo, velut acer anhelitus  
 ipsam

tellurem atque imo quasset fundamine  
 Manes,  
 emicat en rapidus ferventi gurgite torrens.  
 nec tamen adsidue : spumas namque inter  
 et aestum  
 grandia saxa volant ; sic tectis horrida  
 grando,  
 sic tritae saliunt, urguet dum vannus,  
 avenae.  
 hic sibi per saltum et volitantia fragmina  
 montis  
 rumpit iter fluvius sacrisque elabitur undis.  
 deinde brevem vitam rapiens nemora inter et  
 agros  
 implicat innumeros gyros cursumque mora-  
 tur,  
 nequiquam—iam finis adest antrisque pro-  
 pinquat  
 immensis, hominum nulli quae cernere fas  
 est,  
 stagnantisque adeo se condidit aequore  
 ponti  
 cum sonitu : at longe resonare audivit  
 avitas  
 Aeneas voces, certum et praedicere bellum.

We would gladly put before our readers the compositions of many other contributors if we had more space ; but some of these are well known as past masters in the art of composing, and, for the rest, their excellence will attract the reader as he turns over the pages. Unfortunately, there is no list referring the compositions to their respective composers. There is only a list of contributors, to which we must constantly refer if we wish to identify the different translators, who are represented only by initials (not always the same for the same man either) at the foot of each version. We cannot see any reason why the whole name should not be given. The late Professor Jowett is represented, so far as we have observed, by only one piece (xvi.), and that piece is disfigured by a curious error : 'to taste' is rendered by γεύσαι, and the only meaning which γεύσαι could bear, namely, 'to give a taste of,' is absolutely excluded by the sense. Moreover πόσεως dissyllabic in the same version is objectionable. Otherwise editors would certainly have introduced it into Eur. *Med.* 909 :

εἰκὸς γὰρ ὄργας θῆλν ποιέσθαι γένος  
 γάμους παρεμπολῶντος ἀλλοίου πύσσει.

In xv. should not the vocative be Ἰάγον ? It is Ἰάσον in the *Medea*. Is σο ever elided as in xxv. ? In the first line of xli. 'The fire takes' is rendered ἀπται τὸ πῦρ.

Surely this should be ἄπτεται. The active form could only mean 'kindles' transitively, and there is no authority for an impersonal usage as in ἐσάλπιγξε and a few other verbs. The rest of the verse is peculiarly happy. 'It does so. But no flame rises' is beautifully turned by τύφει δ' ἀνηφαίστω μένει. In clxx. ὑβρίσων is a very doubtful form. The best edd. read ὑβρίσῃ in Soph. Aj. 560 and ἐνυβριεῖς in Ar. Thesm. 719. In the same

piece 'the cold wind of the stranger,' finds an exact and deft counterpart in the bold expression ἀνέλλγες πνοαί.

We are glad to find that in the Latin lyric pieces no countenance is given to the theory that we are bound to conform to the *synapheia* observed in the fourth book of Horace's odes but neglected in the first three.

R. Y. T.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### ROUSE'S DEMONSTRATIONS IN GREEK IAMBIC VERSE.

I SHOULD like to correct one or two mistakes in Dr. Gow's review of *Demonstrations in Greek Iambic Verse*. The line he cites as containing a molossus:—

πόρρωθεν | εἰσόψει | τὸ Δαρδάνου | πέδον  
has no caesura, the rhythmical pauses coming where I have drawn upright lines. In the normal iambic, with caesura, which I was discussing, the molossus can only go where Δαρδάνου stands above. Again, in τῆς ὀρθοβούλου Θέμιδος αἰπυμῆτα παῖ, the first metrical group is τῆς ὀρθοβούλου, five syllables. It is true νῦν δ' might stand here, and I am therefore altering the statement in my book, with thanks to Dr. Gow; but both his criticisms show that he

has not understood the metrical analysis of the iambic. This is one of the many proofs that the system of teaching by foot-scansion or metrical snippets (if I may borrow a word of Dr. Gow's) is vicious.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

I SAID that the type πόρρωθεν εἰσόψει το Δ. π. was good enough 'for occasional use.' Mr. Rouse himself says (p. 11) that it 'may be imitated.' I fully agree with him that, in teaching verse-composition, we have to instil the habit of thinking in metrical phrases, but it struck me that his rules would exclude some phrases unnecessarily.

J. G.

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

### RECENT EXCAVATIONS IN ROME.

(SEE C.R. 1899, Pp. 184, 232, 321, 464).

THE excavations of the Forum still continue upon a large scale, and are likely to do so for a considerable time yet. The purchase and demolition of the Church of S. Maria Liberatrice will render it possible to unite the Forum with the Palatine; the road between them has been suppressed, the site of the church is practically clear for excavation, and further important results may be looked for. A short account of what has been done since the middle of last November up to the present time follows.

#### I.—Comitium and Curia.

The ground in front of the Curia (S. Adriano) has been entirely cleared, and the

façade of the building exposed down to the ancient level. The concrete foundation of the steps by which it was approached from the Comitium extends along the greater part of the front of the building. When the level rose, and the steps were no longer in use, the area in front of them was used as a burial ground in connexion with the church into which the Curia was converted. Some hundreds of skeletons were found, a few lying in terra-cotta (or in one case in marble) sarcophagi, but in most cases simply covered with earth. Other bodies were placed in longitudinal niches cut in the brickwork of the façade, or in graves hollowed in the concrete of the steps. Several pagan inscriptions, including part of a dedication to Julia Domna and Septimius Severus by the Kalatores



pontificum et flaminum, were used to cover the sarcophagi.

The door of the Curia shows clearly the vicissitudes of the building. The original doorway, of which portions of the jambs remain, was only a few steps above the level of the Comitium. After the fire of 1084, the level was raised nine or ten feet, but by degrees the door was buried again, and the view of Duperac (*Vestigi dell' Antichità di Roma*, 1575, pl: 3) shows that in his time it was necessary to descend a few steps to reach it. In consequence of this, when the church was restored in 1654, the threshold of the new door was placed at the top of the second door, and the floor raised to about eighteen feet above the ancient level. In modern times the level has been raised yet another three feet. A portion of the architrave of the door of the Curia (probably belonging to the fifth century) has been discovered, bearing the following words: ...[im]perant[.....] | n]eratus in [.....] | c]uriam sen[atus]....." When the building was converted into a church by Pope Honorius I, this architrave was plastered over, and a metrical inscription painted upon it in red letters, of which the word 'aspice' remains.

The pavement of the interior is practically intact, and much of the marble decorations of the walls remains; but owing to the opposition of the monks who own the church above, it has not been possible to proceed more than a few feet within the doorway.

After the removal of the mediaeval cemetery in front of the Curia, the rough travertine pavement of the Comitium of the latest period was discovered. Upon this rests—about 10 yards from the N angle of the Curia—a rectangular pedestal, bearing upon one side an inscription as follows: 'Marti invicto patri et aeternae urbis suae conditoribus dominus noster imp. Maxentius p. f. invictus Aug.' on another side the date 21st April (probably of the year 308), the birthday of Rome. The original inscription, which had occupied all the four sides of this pedestal, is still entirely preserved on the other two sides, while there are traces of it on the side on which the date of Maxentius' inscription is given. It is a dedication to Antoninus Pius, erected on August 1st, 154 by the collegium fabrum tignariorum. Professor Hülsen, speaking at the German Institute, proposed to connect the re-erection of the base by Maxentius with the 'niger lapis' in the form in which we see it. This, in view of Maxentius' fondness for recalling the memory of the founders of Rome, is not

improbable. The fact that the 'niger lapis' seems to be in connexion with a better travertine pavement, lying immediately below that on which the pedestal stands, is no obstacle, as the pedestal does not, probably, stand in the original position in which Maxentius placed it, but has beneath it 4 or 5 inches of earth. The theory that the bronze wolf now in the Palace of the Conservators at one time stood upon this pedestal has less to commend it.

Immediately in front of the Curia is a large, very shallow basin of white marble, in the centre of which was placed an octagonal base—perhaps for a fountain basin, which a lead pipe discovered a little way off may have supplied. This is in connexion with the uppermost travertine pavement, and immediately below it is a marble pavement, corresponding with the better travertine pavement near the 'niger lapis' in which are visible holes for a railing for dividing the space immediately in front of the Curia from the rest of the Comitium. Below this again are a few slabs, finely cut and jointed, of a travertine pavement, carefully laid on a stratum of hard red cement, and oriented in correspondence with the Curia of the Republic, which faced due S.

Further excavations round the 'niger lapis' have led to the discovery of a round well, lined with curved slabs of tufa, of considerable depth, which now awaits exploration. There have also been found on the S of the 'niger lapis' several small pits, about three feet square, and only four or five feet deep, enclosed by blocks of tufa, the bottom of which is formed of pounded earth and the object of which is quite uncertain. Three similar pits, but of irregular shape, exist close to the lion pedestals.

## II.—Rostra.

At the S.W. end of the Rostra of Julius Caesar, and in contact with it, a fine specimen of the earlier travertine pavement of the Forum has been found. It continues on under the supposed site of the *Milliarium Aureum*, of which no traces whatever have been discovered, and which can hardly have occupied this position.

## III.—Basilica Aemilia.

A very interesting article by Professor Lanciani has just appeared in the *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale* for July–December 1899, p. 169. The excavations have shown that there were probably 15 pilasters in the front line, about 17 feet apart from centre to centre: besides

these, at each end was a projecting wing of one intercolumniation (of that at the N.W. end no traces have as yet been found), giving a total length of at least 93 yards (which is far greater than was expected). Between these wings was a marble paved footway six yards wide, approached from the road by two steps, two more steps leading up into the basilica. The tabernae were arranged against the outer wall of the central hall in correspondence with the intercolumniations. The central hall had a nave 53 feet wide and two aisles each 14 feet wide. The pavement of large slabs of coloured marble is extremely fine, and in places very well preserved, though it must have been seen by the devastators of the sixteenth century, who removed even the blocks of travertine which served to support the bases of the columns. These were of Chian marble, three feet in diameter (the intercolumniation being 13 feet), and various fragments of them have been found, much calcined. The controversy as to the provenance of the 24 columns of Phrygian marble in the basilica of S. Paolo is thus definitely settled, not to mention the fact that they are clearly too large for the bases of the central hall, and it would seem that Pliny (*H.N.* 36, 102) is mistaken in speaking of columns of this marble as being the chief glory of the basilica Aemilia. Fragments of smaller columns of Chian marble, belonging to the upper storey of the central hall, have also been found.

Two fragments of an inscription relating apparently to the restoration by Tiberius, which have recently been discovered, make it somewhat doubtful whether the great inscription in honour of Lucius Caesar (*C. R.* 1899, p. 465) really belongs to the basilica or no. Professor Lanciani, in the article above cited, expresses considerable doubts.

The whole building shows considerable traces of the action of fire; the pavement of the central hall is covered with molten copper coins, which apparently fell upon it in a red hot condition; and pieces of charred wood have also been found.

#### IV.—*Atrium Vestae.*

In a cloaca in one of the rooms on the south side of the court was found a heap of 397 gold coins in mint condition, all (except one of Constantius II.) belonging to the latter half of the fifth century, the great majority, 345, being coins of Anthemius (468—472, A.D.), ten belonging to his wife Euphemia, and 24 more to Leo, who reigned

contemporaneously in the East. It is probable, therefore, that they were hidden in 472, the year of the rebellion of Ricimer. Full particulars, with photographs, are given in the *Notizie degli Scavi* dated September 1899 p. 325, the find having actually taken place in November.

The way in which the pavements were raised and the walls rebuilt further away from the hill, leaving a space between the later and the earlier walls, as the damp was felt more and more, has been strikingly shown in the course of the excavations on the south-west side of the Atrium.

In the N.E. corner of the building, in a chamber belonging to the older habitation of the Vestals, the walls of which are of opus quadratum, a small altar of concrete, faced with white stucco, has been discovered; it stands in a corner and is surrounded by a small stone gutter.

#### V.—*Porticus Margaritaria.*

Beyond the S.E. end of the Atrium Vestae a large brick building is being excavated, the remains of which bear out the theory of Lanciani (*Ruins and Excavations*, p. 209) that this site was occupied by the Porticus Margaritaria, and correspond with the plan given by him. They consist of a large number of chambers about five yards square, arranged in rows on each side of a back-wall, and accessible from one side only, resembling closely in plan the 'horrea piperataria.'

In the centre of the building the partition walls do not seem to exist, and it would seem that there was a larger space broken up only by square brick pillars: the dilapidation is however, considerable, and the excavations have not yet reached completion. The brickwork is not particularly good (the mortar being thick, and the bricks rather small), and looks like 3rd. century work (some at the N. W. end is better); there are two relieving arches of tiles, one above the other, in each wall. Many walls have travertine corbels as if for wooden floors; they were all, apparently, faced with rough white cement. The building is not upon the level, but rises both towards the south-east and towards the south-west, following the slope of the hill.

In later times this building has been used as the foundation for another, reconstructed apparently on the same ground-plan. Massive foundations of concrete have been sunk where necessary—to these belong the two great parallel walls which cut across the earlier Sacra Via—; sometimes the openings

have been filled up with late masonry. Many of the rooms have been half filled with great masses of concrete, upon which the floors of the new building were laid.

At the S.E. end the late concrete foundations cut through the remains of a house of the late Republican or early Imperial period, slightly differently oriented, constructed of rough opus reticulatum of yellow-brown tufa, with quoins of the same material. One chamber has a floor of white marble slabs, surrounded by a wide strip of black mosaic with two lines of white as a border, and with fragments of various coloured marbles scattered among the black cubes. Adjacent to it are the remains of two small storerooms, with floors of *opus spicatum*, and quarter-round mouldings of cement at the bottom of the walls. Further S.W. and at a rather higher level, though belonging to the same house, is a chamber containing a hand-mill *in situ*, and several entire amphorae, besides a heap of fragments: close to it is a well, which is producing some fine specimens of household pottery, lamps, etc. The room has been cut through by the later concrete foundations, but parts of its walls have been left standing, and strengthened in places with brickwork to enable them to bear the weight of the building above.

#### VI.—*Sacra Via*.

The excavation of the buildings upon the N.E. side of the earlier *Sacra Via*, between it and the Basilica of Constantine, has been completed. They belong in the main to the horrea piperataria of Domitian (Chronogr. a. 354—Mommsen, *Monumenta Germaniae auct. antiquiss.*, vol. ix. p. 146 'horrea piperataria ubi modo est basilica Constantiniana'), as may also be recognised from their plan—a series of square chambers arranged in rows on each side of a backwall, with doors in front and a passage between each row. In front—i.e. at the W. end—was a colonnade, of which two travertine bases, and a slab of travertine paving remain. The construction is of brickwork—earlier buildings, probably of the same nature, in reticulatum and opus quadratum, oriented in the same way, have been used as foundations—the thresholds are of travertine, the floors of opus spicatum.

Close to the travertine bases of the colonnade have been found two interesting wells—one with the sides formed of five curved tufa slabs with two sets of footholes (the usual type of well of the republican period), in which were found, amongst other things, many bones of animals which had been sawn in pieces—the refuse of a butcher's shop.

The other well, close by, is mediaeval: the well head was a drum of a fluted white marble column hollowed out. Within it were found two entire marble columns, and various decorative fragments, some of them belonging to the ninth century A.D. The investigation of wells has been one of the most interesting features of the present excavations—their number seems to be unlimited, and they seem to belong either to the republican or to the mediaeval period.

A controversy has recently arisen as to the age of the later pavement of the *Sacra Via*, which has now been almost entirely removed in consequence of the excavation of the earlier road. Professor Norton, in a letter to the *Times* of Feb. 13th, spoke of 'the late road which Lanciani had mistaken for the Sacred Way.' Professor Lanciani replied on the 23rd, maintaining that this road was due to Maxentius; and this appears to be the case. The change of direction is, as I have already stated (*C.R.* 1899, p. 467), due to the erection of the Basilica of Constantine (begun by Maxentius) and of the Porticus Margaritaria, and the increase in width may be taken to be due to the great size of these buildings. The change of level cannot be assigned to any period later than the construction of the entrance to the Basilica from the *Sacra Via*; for this upper pavement corresponds with the level of the foundations of this addition to the Basilica, i.e. with the line where the brick facing stops and the rough concrete begins, a line which ascends in correspondence with the slope of the road.

(At one point there is a piece of pavement—apparently *in situ*—about two feet below the level of this foundation line, and four or five above the pavement of the newly-discovered earlier *Sacra Via*. This may belong to some intermediate period, between the construction of the Basilica and the addition of the steps down to the *Sacra Via*.)

But we can date the change of level even earlier—at any rate at the upper end of the slope, immediately before the church of S. Francesca Romana is reached. Here the pavement of this 'late road' is laid immediately above the walls of the 'horrea piperataria,' which, though probably rebuilt after their destruction in the fire of Commodus, certainly ceased to exist when the Basilica was built. Thus, whether the actual pavement at the upper level is of ancient or mediaeval origin, it certainly preserves to us the line of the ancient road; and it may be noted that in the description of the excavations of 1878 (*Notizie*

*degli Scavi*, 1878, p. 341) the following passage occurs:

'The pavement of the famous road is already exposed for the whole distance between the arch of Fabius and the double temple of Hadrian (the temple of Venus and Rome). Upon the ancient pavement (which is in bad condition and full of gaps) is laid a second, about 1·10 mètres higher, to the level of which correspond remains of buildings of the mediaeval period.'

The bad condition of the pavement may

be accounted for by the continual traffic upon it at a time when it was not kept in careful repair.

The pavement under the church of S. Francesca Romana, which at first seemed to be so good that it must belong to the earliest line of the Sacra Via straight across the Velia ridge, is simply the pavement of Maxentius protected by the church built upon it, which church dates from the eighth century at latest.

THOMAS ASHBY, JUNIOR.

### LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

- Aelian*. Stefani (Ed. A. de.) Scholia codicis Laurentiani lxxxvi, 7, in Aeliani historiam animalium. 8vo. 3 pp. (Extract.) Firenze.
- Aeschylus*. Septem contra Thebas. Edited with Introduction, Notes, Vocabulary, Test Papers and Translation by F. G. Plaistowe. Crown 8vo. 126 pp. Clive. 5s. 6d.
- Cagnat* (R.) et M. Bresnier. L'Année épigraphique. Revue des publications épigraphiques relatives à l'antiquité romaine. 8vo. 24 pp. Paris, Leroux.
- Comparati* (Dom.) Iscrizione arcaica del foro romano illustrata. 4to. 24 pp. Firenze.
- Cyrillus*. Knappitsch (A.) S. Cyrilli, episcopi Hierosolymitani, catechesibus quae principia et praecepta moralia continentur, arte conclusa profert. 8vo. 51 pp. Graz.
- Demosthenes*, on Peace, 2nd Philippic, on Chersonesus: 3rd Philippic. With Introduction and critical and explanatory notes by J. E. Sandys. 12mo. 332 pp. Macmillan. 5s.
- Dittenberger* (Guil.) Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum. Vol. II. Ed. II. 8vo. v., 825 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 18 M.
- Herodotus*. Oeri (A.) De Herodoti fonte Delphico. 8vo. 68 pp. Basel.
- Hoffmann* (H.) Bemerkungen zur Übertragung des Epithetons bei den grossen griechischen Tragikern. 8vo. 52 pp. Kempten.
- Homer*. Ludwig (A.) Die Rhapsodien der Ilias A—z in Bezug auf ihre Zusammensetzung analysiert. (Aus "Sitzungsberichte der böhmischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.") 8vo. 34 pp. Prag, Rivnac. 50 Pf.
- Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, herausgegeben von Alfr. Fleckeisen. Suppl. Vol. 26. Part I. 8vo. 90 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 M. 80.
- Joannes Malalas*. Bourier (H.) Ueber die Quellen der ersten vierzehn Bücher des Johannes Malalas. I. 8vo. 46 pp. Augsburg.
- Juvenalis ad satiram sextam in codice Bodl. Canon. XLI. additi versus sex et triginta*. Exscripsit E. O. Winstedt. 8vo. Facsimile plate. Frowde. 1s.
- Kekule von Stradonitz* (R.) Vorläufiger Bericht über die von den kgl. Museen begonnenen Ausgrabungen in Milet. (Aus "Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften.") 8vo. 12pp, 3 engravings. Berlin, Reimer. 50 Pf.
- Knafitzsch* (K.) Einiges über die Stellung des röm. Patriciats in der I. Hälfte des II. Jahrh. v. Chr. und die Scipionen-Processe. 8vo. 22 pp. Wien.
- Limes (Der Römische) in Oesterreich*. Herausgegeben von der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Part I. 4to. 144 columns, 14 plates, 34 engravings. Wien, Holder. 8 M.
- Ludwig* (K.) Das keltische und römische Brigantium. Eine geschichtliche Studie. 8vo. 28 pp. Bregenz.
- Lygias*. Eratosthenes and Agoratus. Edited with Introduction, Text and Notes by T. R. Mills and J. Thompson, translation by W. H. Balgarni, and Vocabulary and Test Papers. Crown 8vo. (University Tutor. Series.) Clive. 5s. 6d.
- Mair* (G.) Jenseits der Rhipäen. C. Der karthagische Admiral Himilko ein Vorläufer und Wegweiser des Pytheas von Massilien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Bernsteinhandels. 8vo. 54 pp. Pola.
- Phrynichus*. Kaibel (G.) De Phrynicho Sophista. 8vo. 37 pp. Göttingen.
- Plato*. Gorgias. Mit Einleitung und Kommentar für die Gymnasialprima herausgegeben von J. Stender. 8vo. xiii, 194 pp. (Klassikerausgaben der griechischen Philosophie IV.) Halle, Waisenhau. 1 M. 60.
- Ribbeck* (O.) Geschichte der römischen Dichtung. II. Augusteisches Zeitalter. 2nd Ed. 8vo. vii, 373 pp. Stuttgart, Cotta. 8 M. 75.
- Smith* (Sir W.) History of Greece from earliest times to Roman Conquest. New edition, rewritten by G. E. Marindin. Crown 8vo. 630 pp., maps, plans. Murray. 7s. 6d.
- Strena Helbigiana*. Sexagenario obtulerunt amici a. d. IIII. Non. Febr. 1899. Royal 8vo. vi, 348 pp. engravings, plates. Leipzig, Teubner. 40 M.
- Studi italiani di filologia classica*. Vol. VII. 8vo. 504 pp. Firenze, Seeber. 20 lire.
- Tacitus*. Gerber (A.) et A. Greef, Lexicon Taciteum Fasc. xiv. ed. A. Greef. Royal 8vo. pp. 1489 to 1600. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 M. 60.
- Terence*. Tschernjaew (P.) Terentiana. Ueber die Redeweise des Demea in der Terenzianischen Komödie "Adelphoe." Eine Studie aus dem Gebiete des sogenannten Vulgarlateins. 8vo. 17 pp. Kasan. 1 M. 50.
- Tschernjaew, (P.) Terentiana. Des traces de Térence dans Ovide, Horace et Tite Live. 8vo. 16pp. Kasan.
- Thiersch* (H.) "Tyrrhenische" Amphoren. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der altattischen Vasenmalerei. 8vo. 32 pp. München.
- Valerius Flaccus*. Heeren (A.) De chorographia a Valerio Flacco adhibita. 8vo. 90 pp. Göttingen.
- Wendel* (Car.) De nominibus bucolicis. (Aus "Jahrbücher für class. Philol.") 8vo. 90 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 M. 40.
- Wheeler* (B. I.) Alexander the Great: merging of East and West in Universal History. Crown 8vo. 536 pp. (Heroes of the Nations.) Putnam. 5s.
- Wilhelm* (A.) "Eros und Eurytos." (Aus "Sitzungsberichte der K. Akademie der Wissenschaft.") 8vo. 14 pp. Wien, Gerold. 40 Pf.